

## Resolved Issues

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
01	Tax Exempt: Does the ESP currently get Tax Exempt status on 810? Is the ESP required to have certificates for existing exempt customers? (New West Energy)	10/13/99	Billing		11/10/99	11/10/00 End-use customer responsibility to provide tax exemption status to each of their providers. 02/02/00 Bill Rigsby to bring tax statutes to Billing on 02/09/00 for clarification. May be included in recommendation. Resolution still stands.		Resv
02	Credit/Debit Amount by record (APS)	10/13/99	Billing		11/10/99	Will be added to Implementation Guide as an optional code.  02/02/00 Resolution still stands.		Resv
03	Balance (BAL) vs. Total monetary value summary (TDS) for invoice payment. Issue for UDC, they cannot bill past due charges since they may not be aware of payment amounts and dates.	10/13/99	Billing		11/10/99	UDC will not send payment information to ESP because ESP is covering customer's receivable to UDC.  02/02/00 Resolution still stands. UDC will send current charges only for ESP consolidated billing.  02/08/00 Revisit when the Implementation Guide is written.		Resv
04	Invoice Start & End Date: Do we need to state on bill?	10/13/99	Billing		10/13/99 02/02/00	Rule Language (R14-2-1617) states "time period to which the reported information applies"  02/02/00 Proposed rule has changed. Consensus that both parties shall disclose this information (R14-2-210). Resolution stands.		Resv
05	Reason for Estimate - Do both parties need to give?	10/13/99	Billing		11/10/99	No, Billers responsibility to print this in bill using 867 standard estimation reason codes. See Business Rules.  02/02/00 Resolution stands.		Resv
06	Should non-utility charges be included on ESP consolidated bills? (New West Energy)	10/13/99	Billing		11/10/99	UDC cannot pass charges for non-utility related charges for printing on an ESP Consolidated Bill. Example: home security, Internet services.  02/02/00 Resolution stands.		Resv
07	How will Rebate/Rebill be handled? (APSES/New West Energy)  ESP	10/26/99	Billing		7/19/00	Confirm this as a business decision. Will this be handled as cancel/rebill or adjustment line item. This can be translated to EDI rule. Issue can be raised in 12/03/99 PSWG Meeting.  UIG recommends cancel/rebill scenario. Most UDCs can support the cancel/rebill scenario.	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>MRSP must post corrected EDI 867s for retrieval by all parties. Three categories of Billing Adjs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Usage Related (dead meter, bad multiplier, etc.) Cancel/rebill</li> <li>2. Rate related (incorrect rate calculation) Cancel/rebill</li> <li>3. Non-usage related (flat rate, tax changes) Misc. Adjustment</li> </ol> <p>02/02/00 Still an issue. Also, what happens if ESP or UDC discovers a need to backbill and customer has switched several times since original billing took place. (R14-2-210E) See Cancel/Rebill discussion document.</p> <p>03/08/00 <u>Action:</u> (APS) will bring a copy of an actual 810 showing a cancel/rebill and how it is represented in EDI format. (All UDCs) need to report on their cancel/rebill thresholds. (All participants) need to identify business issues in relation to rebate/ rebill and misc. adjustments. (ESPs) will bring actual scenarios of their experiences in CA.</p> <p>03/22/00 Discussion re: way of communicating specified rebate/rebill information outside of the 810 for interim. <u>Action:</u> UDC's to discuss the interim proposal and be prepared to discuss outcome.</p> <p>04/06/00 UDC's still evaluating long term and short term process. <u>Action:</u> UDC's to complete review of items for rebill data. Determine short term process we can commit to.</p> <p>05/24/00 APS and TEP suggested changes to BEN and Rebate/Rebill notifications. <u>Action:</u> (Janie Mollon) will incorporate and distribute implementation plan, implementation guide and samples for review by 06/06/00. Proposed notification processes will be presented at 06/22/00 Billing and PSWG meetings.</p> <p>06/22/00 Proposal approved by Billing subcommittee.</p>		
08	UDC Information - Does UDC have to pass contact information address, etc. on each transaction – including the ACC phone number?	10/26/00	Billing		02/24/00	<p>02/02/00 (Stacy Aguayo) contacted two ESPs. Their preference is to have static information, such as emergency numbers, etc. not passed each time on the 810 document every time a customer bills. More discussion by market participants is needed.</p> <p>02/08/00 (New West Energy ) If UDCs continue to pass static data, they will null it in their system.</p> <p>Proposal: UDC will provide the UDC emergency contact number and ACC dispute phone number once. ESP will provide this information on each bill. UDC will advise ESP 30 days written notice in advance of any change to this information.</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>02/24/00 UDCs will make available to PSWG a consolidated list of UDC Emergency Contact Numbers. Responsibility of UDCs to communicate to subsequent ESPs the UDC Contact Number and ACC dispute number to ESP when ESP Service Agreement is executed.</p> <p>Long-term Solution: UDC will provide UDC emergency contact numbers and ACC number to ESP at time of certification with UDC.</p> <p>02/24/00 Proposal above was accepted.</p>		
09	Are tables graphs applicable this year/last year/last month?	10/26/00	Billing		02/24/00	<p>This data will not be passed on 810 to ESP for Consolidated Billing.</p> <p>02/02/00 Resolved pending rule investigation.</p> <p>02/08/00 No requirements found in Rules. UDC will not pass this information and ESP is not required to print this information on bill.</p> <p>02/24/00 Issue resolved. 810 will not have a place to pass last months/last years consumption for ESP to place in a table.</p>		Resv
10	<p>Business, Regulatory Notices and advertising messages - How to handle? What would be size (# of lines) and content/placement on the bill? Example: disconnect notices, Levelized changes, capital credits.</p> <p>How do we anticipate handling non-regulatory messages on the bill.</p>	10/26/99	Billing		03/08/00	<p>Need to offer a bill message field on the guide to pass Regulatory or Business information. Advertisements would be handled through contractual agreements between ESP and UDC.</p> <p>02/02/00 <u>Action</u>: Utilities to research their company's bill message size, # of characters, # of bill messages used.</p> <p>02/08/00 <u>Action</u>: UDC to come back with type of bill messages they intend to send for ESP Consolidated billing. Shirley Renfro will bring information from CA, CUBR, UIG.</p> <p>Proposal for broadcast message types: UDC will post ACC or Legislated mandatory/regulatory messages on their web site in a timely manner and notify ESP contact there is a new message to be printed on the customer's bill. ESP will retrieve new message verbiage from UDC's web site.</p> <p>Proposal for customer specific messages: UDC will pass ACC or Legislated mandatory/regulatory message with customer's bill data. This will transmit via normal billing process agreed upon between the UDC and ESP. ESP is required to print message on UDC portion of consolidated bill. Advertising and business messages will not be passed by UDC to ESP for printing on bill.</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
11	Will ESPs want to partake in SurePay? (Debit ESPs Bank Account for monies owed to the UDC)	10/26/99	Billing		11/10/99	Contractual agreement between ESP and UDC.  02/02/00 Resolution applies.		Resv
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> party Billing - (Should UDC continue to offer?)	10/26/99	Billing		11/10/99	Arrangement will need to be made between Biller (in this case the ESP) and their customer.  02/02/00 Resolution applies.		Resv
13	Payment Date appearing on customer's bill.	10/26/99	Billing		11/10/99	Payment date, payment amount and payment received date will not be passed to the ESP on 810 for printing on an ESP Consolidated Bill.  02/02/00 Resolution applies. Since UDC does not know when or if a payment is actually received from the customer in ESP Consolidated Billing, this information will not be passed.		Resv
14	Transmission Charge - Should it be displayed on the bill?	10/26/99	Billing		11/10/99	This will be settled with the Scheduling Coordinator.  02/02/00 Any transmission charge identified as an end-use customer charge will be included in UDC portion of bill. All other charges will be settled with Scheduling Coordinator. Example: Fixed must run charges are identified as an end use customer bill. Resolution stands.		Resv
15	Does standardization need to allow for Summary Billing - ESP Consolidated Billing?	11/10/99	Billing		02/02/00	UDC would need to pass service periods. Would UDC un-summarize customer's bill for ESP Consolidated Billing?  (New West Energy) Biller of end use customer is entity that should summarize the bill. (TEP) not supporting summary billing for Direct Access customers due to cash flow issues. In their proposed tariff (Article 24), but they have not been approved.  02/02/00 (APSES) Biller of end use customer should summarize the bill. (SSVEC - Barry Scott) -- Entity doing billing should provide consolidation. Customers will resist having bills coming from all over the place. In some respects, this would be a step back to go from one bill for electrical service to many.		Resv
16	Will ESPs be required to remit charitable contributions (SHARE/Hero)?	11/10/99	Billing		04/06/00	Discuss 12/03/99 at PSWG meeting.  <b>see Issue 43</b>  (New West Energy) Does not want to be responsible for tracking and remitting funds back to UDC for distribution to the charitable organizations.		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>02/02/00 (APSES) agrees with New West Energy's position. ESP is liable for remitting the pledge amounts to UDC potentially before customer actually pays ESP.</p> <p>(SSVEC - Barry Scott) - Entity producing bill should be responsible for collecting entire payment. They should disburse money accordingly. It will become a quagmire if each competitive entity only feels a responsibility to collect their piece of the pie. (How will we ever handle delinquents and partial payments?) This does not even consider resentment customers will feel about having to send checks to all of these diverse places to make sure their electrical bill is paid. This reasoning should apply to charitable programs as well, for example "Operation Roundup".</p> <p>02/08/00 Who is responsible for paper-work if customer wants to remit charitable contributions</p> <p>03/22/00 <u>Action:</u> UDC's determine what their position is, why they do SHARE program, implications if they don't , and a proposal of how to handle this issue.</p> <p>04/06/00 (ACC - Bill Rigsby) Nothing in rules requiring UDC's or ESP's to remit charitable contributions. (TEP) will only offer charitable contributions for Dual Billing. They will not offer it with ESP Consolidated. Currently undecided on UDC Consolidated billing. (APS) will continue to offer it on all billing options and will maintain the "paperwork". (Trico) thinks they would offer it, but need to evaluate this further. (New West Energy) flexible as long as they don't have to deal with the "paper work".</p> <p>Resolution: There are no regulatory requirements for ESPs to remit payments. An agreed upon arrangement between ESP and UDC would need to be in place to offer any charitable contributions.</p>		
17	Will ESPs support levelized UDC billing line items?	12/01/99	Billing		02/24/00	<p>Could be a hindrance for a customer to go Direct Access (in the case of a large debit balance). ESPs would not want this large debit balance passed to them for payment. More input from ESPs and UDCs needed.</p> <p>02/02/00 (APS) plans to offer this option if they are Billing entity. (TEP) is not planning to offer this billing option for DA Customers. (SSVEC - Barry Scott) Any customer desiring to go to competitive access should settle all of their accounts with UDC first. If we will handle the process as we currently do for a customer going from one UDC to another we will be better off.</p> <p>02/08/00 (SRP) will offer Levelized to customers for UDC Consolidated</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>and Dual billing for distribution charges only. (APS) doesn't offer Levelized for ESP Consolidated. (TEP) doesn't offer levelized billing for DA customer regardless of billing option.</p> <p>Proposal: ESP has option to offer levelized billing to end use customer. UDC will not pass levelized billing line items for ESP Consolidated billing.</p> <p>02/24/00 Above proposal accepted.</p>		
19	Once troubleshooting process has taken place, and UDC is estimating (an MRSP did not deliver data in a timely manner or the read could not be retrieved), should UDC transmit estimation reasons for ESP Consolidated Bill.	02/02/00	Billing			<p>Need to specify under what conditions the UDC could estimate a bill and pass this information to the ESP.</p> <p>02/24/00 (APS - Shirley Renfro) reported the EDI 810 allows for an estimation reason code to be passed to ESP.</p> <p>Proposal: If MRSP fails to provide a meter read and the exception processing window has passed, UDC may estimate and provide an indicator why bill was estimated. ESP is required to print this reason on UDC portion of the bill pursuant to Rule 14-2-210-6B.</p> <p>03/08/00 Reason codes need to be developed before this can be resolved.</p> <p>04/06/00 Resolution: Use a reason code of: Meter Data not available</p> <p>10/19/00 Resolution Stands, issue resolved</p>	1	Resv
20	Can other utility service charges be passed to ESP for Consolidated Billing (gas, water, sewer, telephone, etc.)	02/02/00	Billing		02/02/00	02/02/00 May not be in scope of the PSWG charge. We are focusing on transfer of electric information only. May need to be addressed at a later date.		Resv
21	DA Market Issue – for UDC or Dual billing options, will Summary Billing be available for DA customers?  UDC/Dual	02/02/00	Billing		10/12/00	<p>02/02/00 (TEP) will not offer Summary Billing per pending Article 24. (APS) feels it is a billers service. If APS is the biller they will offer these services. (SRP) will offer these services for Dual or UDC Consolidated Billing.</p> <p>10/12/00 – group agreed this was for info only and resolved – this is an entity specific issue.</p>	3	Resv
22	If customer has a credit or debit balance when they switch to DA, is the utility obligated to refund that money?	02/02/00	Billing		03/08/00	<p>02/08/00 Levelized / Equalizer was briefly discussed regarding debit or credit balances.</p> <p>02/24/00 APS will final out standard offer account and bill customer separately if there is a debit. If customer does not pay and is eligible for</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>disconnect, they notify ESP. If there is a credit they will refund this to customer prior to the switch for DA.</p> <p>Proposal: When customer goes DA and they have a credit balance, with the exception of Capital credits, UDC will apply it to any outstanding receivable owing. UDC will then refund remaining credit directly to customer in accordance to their applicable Rules and Regulations. When customer goes DA and they have a debit balance, it will be the sole responsibility of UDC to collect money from customer.</p>		
23	If utility is holding a customer deposit and customer switches to ESP consolidated billing, is the utility required to refund entire deposit since receivable is paid to UDC by ESP?	02/02/00	Billing		04/06/00	<p>(APS - Stacy Aguayo) went over flow chart for Deposit Process for ESP Consolidated billing and Deposit Process for UDC consolidated billing (see attachment to 02/24/00 Billing minutes)</p> <p>03/08/00 There is no formal Rule requirement dictating deposit refunds for ESP Consolidated billing customers. Current business processes have been identified (see flow) for TEP, SRP and APS. Other UDCs can submit their deposit business processes to the Billing Subcommittee Chairperson. Deposit requirements are to be determined by the individual companies based on their individual credit policies. No further action needed.</p>		Resv
24	<p>When UDC estimates the bill in ESP Consolidated billing, an agreed upon process and timeframe needs to be set for troubleshooting before bill is actually sent to customer. (Marilyn Ferrara)</p> <p>ESP/UDC/Dual</p>	02/02/00	Billing		6/22/00	<p>02/02/00 This is a meter reading to data input billing issue. Examples include the CA model – MADEN Meter and Data Exception Notice. Could be impacted by VEE rule differences, etc.</p> <p>02/24/00 (New West Energy - Janie Mollon) is preparing a suggested model for Arizona to report billing and metering exceptions. Janie will send out proposal and suggestions. <u>Action:</u> Review and send comments to Janie (recommendation, timeline, with your proposed modification.) Janie will compile for next meeting.</p> <p>03/08/00 Billing Subcommittee agreed that an exception process such as the MADEN is needed for handling exceptions. MADEN process will be submitted to Policy Subcommittee for standardization across all subcommittee exception process. All committee members should review document in its entirety and be prepared to discuss implementation issues. (APS - Stacy Aguayo) will check with CA UDCs to see if more MADEN information is available.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> UDCs need to re-evaluate the time frame of estimation. Is there any flexibility before estimating? What notifications should/are in place for notifying MRSPs of missing data?</p> <p>03/22/00 Take BEN proposal to our companies and discuss possibility of</p>	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>implementing this notification process. Be prepared to talk about possible implementation guidelines.</p> <p>04/06/00 <u>Action:</u> UDC's need to determine how many days after read due date will ESP/MRSP be notified of missing data and how many days does MSP have to get data after notification before UDC estimates? <u>Action:</u> If MRSP estimates their reads and the estimates cause an exception to produce, can UDC estimate on an estimate? <u>Action:</u> UDC's check "tolerance" level of their VEE rules.</p> <p>05/24/00 Estimation process for APS and TEP are outlined in BEN (Billing Exception Notice – see ACC report). VEE tolerance levels to be discussed in newly formed VEE Subcommittee.</p> <p>06/22/00 Some changes were recommended to BEN process.</p> <p>10/12/00 BEN has been developed as an interim comm mech until state MADEN (or equiv) is developed. Approved in 6/00 report</p>		
25	What specific VEE rules should utilities use on an ongoing basis to verify and bill off of incoming MRSP reads. (PSWG – Billing)	01/26/00	Meter-VEE		12/5/01	<p>See issue 101</p> <p>01/26/00 Since MRSPs use different algorithms, it's difficult for utilities to determine if MRSPs are performing VEE on an ongoing basis. If utilities use their own VEE systems to verify reads it may cause invalid rejections.</p> <p>02/01/00 What is the utilities responsibility to audit MRSPs? Rules state this certification must take place yearly.</p> <p>04/27/00 A sub/subgroup was formed to review existing VEE rules, develop objectives, changes and proposals (if needed), develop performance measures and monitoring criteria. TEP - Tony Gilloly, APSES, New West Energy - Janie Mollon, C3 Comm, CSC, APS, SRP - Greg Carrel, a representative from the Co-ops (possibly Barry Scott), and possibly First Point. Renee Castillo volunteered to chair this sub/subgroup and will set up a meeting with these participants.</p>		Resolved



#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>06/22/00 Reassigned from Policy to Metering subcommittee</p> <p>10/11/00 – This has previously been assigned to VEE</p> <p>2/21/01 – This issue will be addressed in the MRSP performance monitoring task team with issue 101.</p> <p>Resolved with the Approval of VEE rules 12/05/01</p>		
26	XML versus EDI – What is XML? Should this be considered for a best practice for the Arizona's model? (ACC Staff – Deb Scott and Jerry Smith )	01/25/00	Policy		2/01/01	<p>Issue for Policy subcommittee to investigate. This is not a transport mechanism, it is defined as a data structure.</p> <p>02/01/00 – Ray Wenzel - Excelergy, offered to coordinate a presentation to PSWG on XML. Evelyn Dryer will address with ACC and possibly get this on a large group agenda.</p> <p>Resolution: 2/01/01 – The group agreed that this issue has been resolved at a prior meeting. The rules have been changed to remove the requirement for AZ to use EDI. The group agreed that we would look at this technology in the future when the standards have been further developed.</p>	3	Resv
27	<p>Companies are defining 'workdays' for time frames for work to be completed. Some companies are including holidays that are not recognized by others. Need to define 'standardized workday'. (PSWG – Billing)</p> <p>Suggestion: NERC holidays recognized but modified. If a NERC holiday falls on a Saturday it is recognized on a Friday and if the holiday falls on a Sunday it is recognized on a Monday.</p> <p>Standardized Work Days: Any day except Saturday/ Sunday or NERC holiday. If holiday falls on a Saturday it is recognized on a Friday. If the holiday falls on a Sunday, it is</p>	01/26/00	Policy		02/29/00	<p>In some territories Columbus Day, MLK Day are recognized as holidays and are excluded from a workday calculation. This could affect time periods defined for metering, meter reading, Consolidated billing and enrollment.</p> <p>02/01/00 – Standardization of holidays may not be possible. (Suggestion 1) If Federal or State Holidays are defined, these could be used as an exception to workdays for ALL participants. (Suggestion 2) Use NERC definition of holiday. Evelyn Dryer to provide to the Policy Group.</p> <p><u>Action due 02/15/00:</u> All participants need to take these suggestions to their organizations to see what will work. Items to consider: Cash flow, bill cycles, read cycles, settlement etc. Also, bring a list of your organizations recognized holidays Be prepared to discuss impact to company's if we recommend NERC holidays only, OR if we were to recognize all State and Federal Holidays. (Darrell Pichoff) to bring list of Postal/ Federal Holidays. (Steve Olea) to bring list of State Holidays.</p> <p>02/16/00 – Pending Resolution (see UDC holiday matrix – enclose with minutes).</p> <p>2/29/00 Issue resolved.</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
28	<p>recognized on a Monday.</p> <p>Clarification on when UDC can be an MSP. Both sets of Direct Access rules have different definitions. (ACC Rules and HB 2663) (PSWG – DASR)</p>	01/26/00	Policy		2/1/01	<p><b>see Issue 36 &amp; 56</b></p> <p>Example, in APS territory they cannot be an MSP for any customer except under 20 kW and residential customer.</p> <p>Additionally, when are meter exchanges required within the service territories?</p> <p>02/01/00 In service territory's governed by ACC Competition Rules (R14-2-1615-B), on January 1, 2001 no affected utility can offer competitive services.</p> <p>What if there are no service providers offering these services at a competitive rate after 01/01/01 that make it cost effective for customers to switch? This is a Commission and Legislative issue.</p> <p>(APSES-Barbara Klemstine) Will provide a proposal to group next week showing why the UDC can be an MSP.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> take Barbara's "white pages" to our companies to see if any problems/issues with the document. Be prepared to discuss next week. May need to create a waiver for this. <u>Action:</u> APS to determine implementation issues regarding issues #28, #36, &amp; #56</p> <p>Barry Scott does not want a rule written that choice of MSP has to be chosen by ESP. It should be the customer's choice.</p> <p>There is still issue remaining which will be included on ACC report.</p> <p>2/07/01A joint waiver was filed and approved to allow UDCs to provide MSP/MRSP services to comm LP cust</p>	1	Resv
29	<p>Are 997s required for all transactions? Is that going to be our recommendation for the Arizona standards? (PSWG – Remittance)</p>	01/27/00	Policy		2/07/01	<p>EDI 997s are an industry standard transaction (EDI syntax validation)</p> <p>02/01/00 Yes, a 997 acknowledgement is required on all standardized EDI transaction sets. Policy group will recommend the level of acknowledgement should be determined by the individual trading partners.</p> <p>02/08/00 Is a 997 required for meter data that is extracted from a MRSP web site?</p> <p>2/07/01 – the group agreed that this has been resolved</p>	3	Resv
32	What are true costs of CT/VT	01/27/00	Policy		2/7/01	<b>Issues 32, 44, &amp; 54</b> – (SRP - Renee Castillo) will have more information	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	(PT) if an ESP wants to buy the equipment? Cost to replace equipment at today's market price OR cost to UDC and depreciated by years since installation. (PSWG – Metering)					<p>regarding these items for the 03/08/00 meeting.</p> <p>03/07/00 (ref: 32, 44 &amp; 54) Suggestions: lease CT/PT/VT's or have a long-term purchase plan.</p> <p>APSES-Jim Wonter will contact California to see how they handle CT PT ownership issues.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> UDC's discuss w/ companies lease agreements, long term payment plans and their defense on why want to own them. <u>Action:</u> Clarify rule 14-2-1612-K10. <u>Action:</u> All market participants review rule 14-2-1612-K10. Determine if we want to interpret/re-word using UDC shall own, UDC shall not own, may own or may own at discretion of the customer. Be prepared to defend/come to a consensus.</p> <p>03/14/00 Costs range from roughly \$230-\$3500. <u>Action:</u> ESP's to provide more detail regarding long-term payment plan (how much/how long).</p> <p>APS/TEP will not support a leasing option APS will support the payment plan option only if for the life of the contract between the ESP &amp; customer.</p> <p>03/22/00 ESP's don't want to resort to a lease/payment plan option until issue of UDCs maintaining ownership of CT/PT's has been resolved.</p> <p>05/09/00 (TEP) Per Position document issued by Tony Gilooly, they are still working on costs. (APS) Installed equipment, material and labor, depreciated by 5 years. (SRP) in process of developing IT equipment costs for full metering competition scheduled for 12/31/00. (Mohave and Navopche) Would support selling at Fair market cost to replace equipment. (Sulfer Srpings) Current Book Value minus depreciation.</p> <p>2/07/01 The group agreed this is resolved – a standard is not possible</p>		
33	For access to a meter, some UDCs require ESP to get keys, combos, etc. from customer. In many cases, the customer does not have a key.	01/27/00	Metering		06/22/00	<p>02/03/00 APS is not going to provide keys to MSP. They would like the MSP to get key from customer.</p> <p>MSP and MRSP issues: Customers may not have keys. Utility keys may not be able to be duplicated. Or utilities may want to offer a dual locking device on a contractual basis with utilities and MSPs.</p> <p>New West Energy – This is a barrier to getting access to change meters for customers to go DA.</p> <p>Suggestion - If customer is releasing their customer data (historical)</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>anyhow, could key process be incorporated in release?</p> <p><u>Action:</u> All Utilities need to research what their key policy is and report to subcommittee by 02/16/00. Janie Mollon will bring CA access process.</p> <p>(Schlumberger - Jamie) In case of customer's lock, they are cutting lock and supplying a new lock to customer. Customer responsible for getting a key to UDC for access to site. (Marv Buck – CUBR) suggesting UDCs change customer supplied locks with UDC supplied locks. Then UDC retains possession of master key and can supply slave keys to customer for them to get to MSP and ESP.</p> <p>Proposal: For customer supplied locks, MSP will cut the lock, if applicable, and supply customer with a new lock and keys. Customer's responsibility to get new key to UDC. MSP will communicate access changes back to UDC on the MIRN form in remarks section.</p> <p>(Citizens Utilities) UDC requires access to metering equip on customers premises for safety reasons and already have keys that were supplied to the customer. ESP should be responsible for supplying UDC with a key to any lock changed on the customer's metering form. It is not reasonable to require customer to produce another key for UDC.</p> <p>05/18/00 Phaser (Janet Henry) CA gives MSP keys to their locks and lockboxes. – A question was asked "who is responsible/liable during the time MSP cuts UDC lock and the time UDC gets back out there to replace their lock?" Solution: UDCs provide MSPs with padlocks to seal UDC side of locking device.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> (due 06/21) UDCs determine if they can give a supply of UDC locks to MSPs operating in their territory.</p> <p>06/21/00 Proposal: For customer supplied locks, MSP will cut lock, if applicable, and supply customer with a new lock and keys. MSP will place a dual hasp on customer's lock and then seal up the other hole on hasp. This will be indicated on MIRN form for UDC to replace the seal with UDC lock. If MSP cuts UDC lock, they will replace it with a dual hasp with a new customer lock and a seal where UDC lock will be placed. This will be noted on MIRN form and UDC will replace the seal in their normal course of business.</p> <p>06/22/00 Resolution: For customer supplied locks, MSP will cut the lock, if applicable, and supply customer with a new lock and keys. Customer's responsibility to get new key to UDC. MSP will communicate access</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						changes back to UDC on the MIRN form in remarks section.		
34	There is no formalized process to report meter exceptions between UDCs and ESPs. Examples: agreement metering programming, if MI/MAC forms are not completely filled out, etc. See MADEN for details on exception reasons. (PSWG – Metering)	01/27/00	Policy		2/7/01	<p><b>see Issue 52</b></p> <p>(New West Energy - Janie) will provide information regarding this.</p> <p>Proposal: Consensus that a formal communication method (similar to MADEN) will be utilized. Details of what data elements/guidelines will be discussed in both the metering &amp; billing subcommittees.</p> <p>Group agreed this was resolved 2/7/01 by creating separate issue</p>	3	Resv
35	At what point does an ESP take responsibility on a meter exchange? And who is responsible for energy consumption during the exchange?	01/27/00	Metering		02/21/01	<p>02/03/00 <u>Action</u>: Utilities to report on their processes 02/16/00.</p> <p>06/21/00 Proposal: Point in time when ESP takes responsibility depends on switch procedures in the separate UDC territories.</p> <p>07/19/00 Discussion centered on calculation of usage, responsibilities of entities in calculation, and how it is reflected on the MIRN form. Group consensus that if meter is out more than 15 minutes, usage will be calculated. Group agreed that except for scheduling and lost registrations, the process is complete. <u>Action</u>: (UDC) determine what they need to calculate usage and how they to incorporate into their procedures for Aug mtg.</p> <p>08/16/00 Discussion regarding who is the responsible party. No clear language in CC&amp;N or Rules that indicate MSP is responsible for calculating Lost Registration. <u>Action Item</u>: APS, APSES and New West Energy research past meter exchanges to determine how long meters are typically out of the socket. Some participants believe amount of unaccounted for energy is so insignificant it may not warrant the calculation. <u>Action Item</u> (due Sept mtg): All participants present their proposed load limit that lost registration would need to be calculated.</p> <p>10/11/00 Refer to UDC Business Rule Comparison document for UDC requirements or state standard</p> <p>11/29/00 Re-opened based on discussion passed from VEE. The group had agreed on when the ESP or UDC take responsibility for the customer. The group has now discussed a different option. If a non-IDR meter is involved in the exchange, the responsibilities will end/begin at a different interval than if the exchange only involves IDR meters. The reason for this is to ensure that there are no gaps in data and that the customer is not billed twice for the same time. See Business Rule document for examples. <u>Action Item</u>: review proposed changes and report back at next mtg.</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						2/21/01 Resolution–The group agreed on the posting requirements for beginning and ending data during the January meeting. UDCs business rules on when the UDC/ESP responsibility ends/begins was updated in the business rule doc and will be included in the metering handbook that is under development.		
36	ACC Rules Question: Can UDC provide metering and installation services for DA customer? Short term and after January 1, 2001? (PSWG –Metering)	01/27/00	Policy		2/7/01	<p><b>see Issue 28 &amp; 56</b></p> <p><u>Action:</u> Participants need to read the ACC and HB2663 and be prepared to discuss issue.</p> <p>2/07/01 The group agreed this is resolved – Joint waiver approved to provide these services</p>	1	Resv
37	Load research meters- Are UDCs intending have a dual meter installed or are they going to pick another sample customer when the customer goes DA? Will UDCs allow ESPs to use existing phone line to read meter for DA purposes? Or vice versa - can UDC use ESP phone lines?	01/27/00	Metering		4/27/00	<p>02/03/00 <u>Action</u> (due 012/16/00): Utilities to document and report what the process will be for handling Load Research meter.</p> <p>02/16/00 (SRP) will choose new sample. In most cases, phone line owned by the customer. (APS) will choose new sample. In a few cases, they will remove their existing phone line.</p> <p>04/27/00 Refer to UDC Business Rule Comparison document for UDC requirements or state standard (to be included with PSWG report to the Commission.)</p>	1	Resv
38	Will UDCs allow ESPs to interrogate meters on non-DA customers for load research purposes/ billing option purposes? (PSWG – Metering)	01/27/00	Policy		08/22/01	<p>(New West Energy - Janie) will clarify at 03/13/00 meeting.</p> <p>Details on Issue: Customer is not DA and wants load research data for informational purposes.</p> <p>Example: ESP may be taking multiple customer accounts but not all of them. ESP would like a secondary password to review this information so they can provide information of all sites (even those not going DA) to customer. If there is no IDR meter at site, customer would need to initiate an IDR meter from UDC and pay associated costs.</p> <p>08/22/01 APS- Provided the proper equipment is in place, APS will allow the customer or their authorized third party access to the IDR Data. The customer would be responsible for paying for associated costs</p>	3	Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>if proper equipment is not in place.</p> <p>TEP- Will not allow interrogation.</p> <p>CUC- Will not allow any ESP to directly interrogate Citizens meters, at this time.</p> <p>SRP- If there was a contractual agreement between SRP/ESP and the customer then interrogation would be allowed.</p> <p>COOPERATIVES: Will not allow meter interrogation, at this time.</p> <p>Electrical districts: Not at this time.</p> <p>Issue is resolved, refer to UDC practices.</p>		
39	Do DA meters installed have to have a visual display? This limits equipment types that can be installed.	01/27/00	Metering		9/26/00	<p>02/03/00 TR Recorder does not have a display. Requirement came from a EUSERC. <u>Action</u>: Utilities need to report on their needs for display by 02/16/00. (APS – Jeanine) will check the EUSERC requirements. ESPs will report on what impacts this requirement could have in their organizations.</p> <p>According to ANSI, a display is not 'required'. Further discussion needed. Metering boxes are the way technology is moving, therefore no display. This may be a customer issue.</p> <p>Utilities to report on why a display is needed. Darrel Pichoff to check with RUCO to see if there's a requirement.</p> <p>03/02/00 (Prem Bahl – RUCO) RUCO's position is there must be a visual display on all electric meters for residential consumers. Consumer must be able to read the kWh and kW readings. RUCO will insist on this. (K.R. Saline) represents 24 Irrigation Districts, Electrical Districts, and Municipalities. KRS will insist on visual displays on electric meters for both residential and commercial customers.</p> <p>04/27/00 To be addressed in an upcoming meeting since this issue is currently happening in production today.</p> <p>10/11/00 updated status as resolved – completed in a previous meeting.</p> <p>The Current Rules require visual displays</p>	1	Resv
40	What are UDC processes for scheduling MSP work? What if an MSP picks a date to remove and install a meter and schedule must be changed? How are these exceptions handled?	01/27/00	Metering		04/27/00	<p>02/3/00 May be addressed when we start to review the data elements. Utilities must be able to speak to schedules on metering.</p> <p>04/27/00 MDCR and procedures address this issue. Refer to UDC Business Rule Comparison document.</p>	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<b>RESOLUTION:</b> (Agreed upon business rule): Initial MDCR Form and EPA (if applicable) must be returned at least five (5) workdays prior to the exchange. These documents will be in Excel and sent via email. Notification of changes to the schedule, including rescheduling and unscheduling, must be sent to UDC by 2:00pm (Arizona time) one (1) workday prior to scheduled work date. UDC will communicate any exceptions to MSP within two (2) workdays of the receipt.		
43	Is there a regulatory requirement for UDCs to collect and remit charitable contributions to social agencies. And is there any regulatory requirement for ESP's to participate in collecting or remitting charitable contributions on behalf of UDC.  ESP	02/02/00	Billing		2/07/01	<b>see Issue 16</b>  There is potential for state funds to be reduced because there potentially is no requirement to continue these programs. 10/26/00 waiting to hear from NEC to see if they have a requirement to remit. (John Wallace/Darrel Pichoff to follow-up)  2/07/01 There is nothing in the rules requiring the ESPs to contribute but there can be a requirement for UDCs depending on rate cases	3	Resv
44	Clarify ownership of CT and VTs (PT) based on voltage level. (PSWG – Metering)	02/03/00	Policy		9/01/00	<b>see issue 32 &amp; 54</b>  02/03/00 Will refer to ACC Rules  05/09/00 Clarification of ownership completed - Refer to Business Rule Comparison document from Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee group.  09/01/00– Refer to Business Rule Comparison document from Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee group.	1	Resv
45	Standardized data content, data format and data transmission needed for Metering Data.	02/03/00	Metering		04/27/00	Fax and email are not acceptable forms of data transmission. Trading Partners are not able to populate their databases.  04/27/00 Subgroup has standardized the data content, data format and a basic transmission method (email with Excel spreadsheet). Additional electronic methods will be explored.		Resv
46	All Arizona EDI (DASRs, 867, 810, 650) should utilize GMT for business transactions and local time for the enveloping. To avoid problems and unnecessary costs to conform to national standardization in the future,	01/25/00	Policy		04/25/00	This change would help market participants, particularly MDMA's/MRSPs, to save costs by not having to adapt their systems to Arizona's unique requirements.  <b>Action:</b> All participants need to see what the use of GMT will do to their systems.		Resv



#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	standard time references should be implemented immediately by each UDC and EDI mapping can be phased in. (APSES)					<p>02/16/00 Proposal: All participants will use GMT format for all transactions that require a time stamp. <u>Action</u>: Find out how long the conversion to the GMT format will take. Consensus was reached.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u>: All Arizona EDI transaction set data content will utilize GMT time and GMT time code. The enveloping of EDI transactions will utilize the sender's local time.</p> <p>Implementation Issue: This recommendation refers to the ACC rule that states data transmission will be sent in Arizona time. Policy Group will recommend a change to the ACC Rules.</p> <p>03/28/00 Determined this is not a rule change, it is actually noted in the CC&amp;N's.</p> <p><u>Action</u>: Paul will talk with ACC to determine what needs to take place to get issue resolved. Can staff just send a notice to existing certified entities advising them of the change to GMT?</p> <p>04/25/00 Need to review new proposition. Be prepared to make your company's final decision.</p> <p>GMT was adopted. The original proposal above was adopted. A letter to the Utility Director will be sent by the PSWG.</p>		
48	<p>For all Billing and Metering data, UDCs should employ same rule and/or formula for rounding up data and rounding in calculations. Business process should be implemented immediately by each UDC.</p> <p>Include related changes or impacts to other processes or procedures. (APSES)</p>	01/25/00	Policy		02/29/00	<p>In order to develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by differences in data and billing procedures among UDCs will be removed. Customer confusion will be reduced.</p> <p><u>Action</u>: All participants need to investigate what their rounding processes are on meter reading and billing. They also need to investigate how their CIS/MDMA systems handle rounding.</p> <p>02/16/00 Jim will provide more examples to help define the issue.</p> <p>02/22/00 Jim brought examples of rounding issues and found issues were not widespread and magnitude is fairly small. These issues will be discussed with individual UDCs. Pending resolution at 02/29/00 meeting.</p> <p>02/29/00 No standardization needed.</p>	1	Resv
53	Blackout period for Direct Access meter exchanges is too long and not consistent between UDCs.	01/25/00	Metering		10/11/00	Currently, the three largest UDCs require meters needing to be changed for Direct Access service cannot be changed for a period of time around the current meter's read date. The length of time varies by UDC, but	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	(APSES)					<p>extends up to approximately nine (9) working days for one UDC. This requirement is problematic for ESPs and MSPs because it allows meters to be exchanged during only half of the month for each account (9 working days equates to approximately half of a calendar month). When a customer has multiple accounts on multiple read cycles that all require meter exchanges, MSP must plan their installation schedule around UDC blackout period. This makes it virtually impossible to exchange multiple meters on consecutive days during the month. Since most certified MSPs are installing meters with out-of-state personnel, this requirement adds to the cost of meter exchanges for MSPs and ultimately for ESPs and customers.</p> <p>Proposal: Metering subcommittee should examine process for meter exchanges and shorten or eliminate blackout period requirement. Subcommittee should look at best practices in other states where blackout periods have been eliminated or greatly reduced to foster a more efficient competitive market. Where possible, blackout periods should be consistent across UDCs in the state.</p> <p>Suggestion: (New West Energy - Janie Mollon) To switch customer , MSP could not install a meter five (5) workdays before a read date or two (2) workdays after a read date. The actual switch happens on the read date.</p> <p>03/16/00 (APSES - Jim Wontor) brought another proposal. Eliminate blackout periods and allow customer's to switch on exchange date.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> ESPs will consolidate their proposals for a best practice suggestion on 03/30/00.</p> <p>04/27/00 Refer to ESP Hybrid proposal addressing switch dates and blackout windows. Also, see UDC Response to Provider Hybrid Proposal.</p> <p>Consensus was not reached between TEP, SRP and APS. APS operates currently without a blackout window even though their Schedule 10 allows for a blackout window. SRP does not operate without a blackout window. TEP operates with a 5 workday blackout window.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> APS need to find out how long they are willing to work without for 6 mos. a blackout window. TEP will check with their staff to see if they will work with the 5 workday blackout window and then reevaluate in 6 mos.</p> <p>(Navopache - Dennis Hughes) would agree to work with the 5 workday blackout window with the agreement to reevaluate any market impacts</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>after 6 months. (Trico – Anne Cobb) They certainly see advantages to having a blackout period. They would agree to work with the blackout window with the agreement to reevaluate any market impacts after 6 months.</p> <p>10/11/00 – Resolution refer to UDC Business Rule doc for UDC requirements</p>		
54	Ownership of Current Transformers (CTs) and Voltage Transformers (VTs formerly known as PTs) is not consistent across UDCs. (APSES)	01/25/00	Metering	09/18/00	10/11/00	<p><b>see Issue 32 &amp; 44</b></p> <p>ACC rules for Direct Access and the Electric Competition Act provide for UDC to own and maintain both CTs and VTs. However, interpretation of these rules differs by UDC. One UDC mandates that CT/VTs be purchased by Customer or ESP/MSP if they are below a certain voltage size. Another UDC maintains ownership and maintenance responsibilities of CT/VTs for all customers. And the third major UDC maintains ownership of CT/VTs, but requires ESP/MSP to maintain them. This inconsistency creates difficulty for an ESP, especially when dealing with customers with facilities in more than one service territory. Requiring ESP/MSP or customer to purchase the equipment also adds a potentially significant cost and may be a barrier for many customers who otherwise might seek alternative suppliers. In California, CT/VTs are treated as part of the UDC distribution system and ownership/maintenance responsibilities are retained by UDC.</p> <p>Proposal: Metering Working Group should look at intent of the language in competition rules regarding equipment ownership and make a determination on CT/VT ownership that all UDCs can implement on a consistent basis.</p> <p>03/14/00 <u>Action:</u> APS/TEP will investigate whether they can agree to own CT/VT's above the secondary voltage level (600 volts or less). This will not require a rule change...it will require a tariff change. <u>Action:</u> APS will determine amount of primary customer accounts.</p> <p>Issue: Can customer own their own CT/PT's? Need clarification of the rules.</p> <p>05/09/00 (APS) changing their position regarding ownership of CT/PTs. Position statement is: "APS is agreeable to retaining ownership of CT/sPT's for Direct Access locations providing tariff and operational issues impacted by this change are effectively and equitably resolved. (TEP, Sulfur Springs, Navopache and Mohave) prefer Rules to stay as is regarding CT/PT ownership, however, they are willing to review suggested</p>	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>rule change. (APSES) Recommend rule language change to add "...at discretion of customer" to the end of the first sentence of section R14-2-1612.k section 10.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u> Jim Wontor (APSES) will send out proposed language to PSWG participants by 05/10/00. Participants be prepared with their company position on the proposed language to the 05/23/00 meeting.</p> <p>07/19/00 (APS) handouts re: ownership and pulse overflow discussed. Several Coops support APS new position that UDC own and maintain all CT/PTs. Draft Equipment Authorization Form reviewed. Bulk form may not be necessary with APS change on CT/VT ownership. (APSES) proposed revised language in form.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> (APS) to revise EPS form and send out for (All members) review prior to next meeting discussion. (TEP) to report plans for ownership where an existing CT/PT goes bad and the ESP/MSP replaces it.</p> <p>08/16/00 – (TEP) reported they will provide a replacement CT/VT if existing CT/VT is damaged at no charge to competitive provider. Currently, TEP does not provide CT/VT for new installations. TEP will refile their tariff to separate the CT/VT charge from the other metering charges. Upon approval, TEP will provide CT/VT for new installations. *see TEP handout for additional revised CT/VT information.</p> <p>10/11/00 Resolution See Business Rule Doc for UDC requirements</p>		
55	UDC fees for Direct Access services (CISR, DASR, metering, meter reading, billing, settlement, etc.) are too high and not consistent between UDCs. (APSES)	01/25/00	Policy		4/18/01	<p>The 3 largest UDCs have proposed varying fees for Direct Access services, such as: meter information, submitting Direct Access Service Requests, meter installations or removals, meter reading services, consolidated and/or dual billing, and settlement billing. These fees are, in some cases, excessively high and do not reflect the true marginal cost of providing these services. Many fees are required by one UDC, but not at all by other UDCs. Even when required by all UDCs for same service, fees are not consistent and vary quite substantially. All the various fees provide an additional barrier to development of a competitive market in Arizona.</p> <p>Proposal To develop a viable market in Arizona, a group consisting of market participants should be tasked with determining which fees should be mandatory, which fees should be discretionary, and which fees should be deferred until the market has developed. This group should also recommend which costs could be recovered as part of base rates and which should be recovered in service fees. Finally, the group should recommend a consistent, cost-based methodology for calculating the costs to be recovered by the UDCs.</p>	2	Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						4/18/01 Participants agreed to close the issue, because as Jim Wontor (APSES) suggested, PSWG is not the appropriate place to pursue these issues.		
56	Non-availability of local alternatives for providing competitively priced metering services. (APSES)	01/25/00	Policy		2/7/01	<p><b>see Issue 28 &amp; 36</b></p> <p>Currently, there are very few Meter Service Providers (MSPs) or Meter Reading Service Providers (MRSPs) that have facilities and personnel in Arizona. Most of the certificated providers are based out-of-state and cannot, by ACC rules, subcontract with non-certificated personnel in the state. This potentially drives up the cost of some services that require personnel to travel to Arizona. Additionally, since UDCs cannot provide competitive metering services beyond the year 2000, most have chosen not to provide a full menu of services during the year 2000. Both of these factors produce situations where the cost of providing competitive metering services are higher than they would be if they were provided by personnel already located in the state.</p> <p>Policy Working Group should recommend that, to stimulate market and cost effective provision of competitive services, the following changes should be made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) UDCs should be allowed to provide competitive metering services at a competitive market price, and</li> <li>2) 2) MSP/MRSPs should be allowed to subcontract for services to qualified personnel, without having to make them employees of the company, as long as the certificated MSP/MRSP is still responsible for the work they perform.</li> </ol> <p>03/14/00 Barb Klemstine will change the wording on the MSP qualifications/ requirements that is attached to the CC&amp;N in regards to item 3. She will include wording so that the MSP &amp; their agents will be held to the same rules.</p> <p>White Paper Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TEP &amp; APS agree – waiver will be needed</li> <li>2. TEP &amp; APS don't agree due to procurement &amp; labor issues</li> <li>3. TEP &amp; APS agree with some clarification of the rules.</li> </ol> <p><u>Action:</u> TEP &amp; APS will begin working on a waiver for white paper issue #1 (non-residential load profile)</p> <p>04/11/00 Be prepared to discuss item #2 (subcontracting) at next meeting.</p>	2	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						05/09/00 Bob Grey will check with DebScott to verify status of this issue.  2/07/01 – waiver approved for UDCs to provided MSP/MRSPs services to comm LP cust – moved subcontracting issue to #105		
57	How will we handle customer bill disputes that are filed with the ACC for ESP Consolidated Billing.  ESP	02/08/00	Billing		2/21/01	(ACC -Bill Rigsby) will check at ACC how often customers file complaints with ACC for bill disputes. How will UDCs handle requirement for the ESP to make us whole?  <u>Action:</u> (ACC -Bill Rigsby) to check at ACC for proposed changes  04/06/00 (ACC -Bill Rigsby) - Believes the ACC will be notifying both ESP and UDC regarding any consumer disputes.  Resolution: Billing subcommittee will make a formal recommendation within the report to have ACC notify both ESP and UDC of any formal dispute.  10/11/00 Action Item: ACC to define process for October 26 <sup>th</sup> meeting  10/26/00 Staff is writing a procedure on how to handle this. May have it at Nov 16 <sup>th</sup> mtng  2/07/01 Still waiting on staff to draft procedure – report to be given at 2/21/01  Resolution:2/21/01 Barbara Keene reported that the consumer services departments receives about 7000 complaints per year and most are relative to the bills. All parties will be contacted (i.e. ESP and UDC) when a dispute is being handled at the ACC unless it's clear it only involves one party. Barbara provided a copy of the section in the rules that covers complaints for the group to review.	1	Resv
58	How will bill inserts be handled for ESP Consolidated billing as it relates to mandated regulatory messages?  ESP	02/08/00	Billing		10/12/00	ESPs will not print marketing messages on their bill. In CA, UDCs have to submit their inserts to CPUC for review. If there is marketing language in the inserts, UDCs have to remove the language. ESPs also have an opportunity to review all messages prior to distribution to the customer.  <u>Action:</u> Be prepared to discuss this issue. UDC's determine process for removing marketing language from mandatory messages.  04/06/00 (TEP) will strip their marketing messages from the mandated bill messages. (APS) will not be send bill messages electronically  05/24/00 (New West Energy) wants it sent electronically, then they will print message/stuffer with the bill. (TEP) agreed to send insert	2	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>electronically (email with document attached) and/or post it to their website. (APS) will verify if they can accommodate this proposal.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> APS to verify if they can create WORD document, not PDF, so ESP can transfer data to the bill.</p> <p>06/22/00 Agreement needs to be made between ESP and UDC re: how marketing messages will be delivered (web site, e-mail etc.)</p> <p>10/12/00 Modified 6/22 Resolution : Agreement needs to be made between ESP and UDC on how mandated regulatory messages will be delivered (web site, e-mail etc.)</p>		
59	Need clarification on estimating rules, specifically section 210-A-5C	02/08/00	Policy		2/07/01	<p>Confusion about load profiled customer or customers needing load data. Does this have anything to do with real time pricing?</p> <p>10/12/00 210 A5c The group believe this issue is for 210 A5 c only. Need to determine if it should be a part of our 210 ...waiver Action Item: Shirley will seek clarification with Staff 10/26/00 210 A5c - per Barbara keene this is a DA cust that isn't load profiled 11/01/00 Assigned to Policy</p> <p>2/07/01 Wavier approved resolved.</p>	3	Open
61	Who is responsible for tracking the performance of MSP and MRSP's? What is the performance criteria What is process for communicating this information? (PSWG – Billing)	02/08/00	Metering		11/14/01	<p>see Issue 65</p> <p>06/22/00 Discussion also focused on possible timelines and CUBR has performance standards. Reassigned from Policy to Metering.</p> <p>0720/00 Issue should refer only to MSPs. (TEP) Position on MSP Performance Standards was provided. 2/7/01 – the group confirmed that this issue deals with developing performance monitoring /testing criteria for MSPs</p> <p>2/07/01 – established a task team to develop – John Wallace – Chair due date 4-01</p>	3	Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>3/7/01 The group reviewed and made recommendation to the status report. Additional task team meetings are required.</p> <p>3/21/01 John Wallace (GCSECA) reported that the next Task Team meeting is set for April 13<sup>th</sup> at New West Energy.</p> <p>04/04/01 John Wallace (GCSECA) reported that the next Task Team meeting is now scheduled for April 17<sup>th</sup> (the 13<sup>th</sup> is a holiday) at Grand Canyon State Electric Cooperative building.</p> <p>04/18/01 John Wallace (GCSECA) reported on the status of the task team. The conclusion of the April 17 meeting was to disband until other processes are completed in order to have processes to monitor. Janie Mollon would like to see work continue to be a model for other states and to improve customer relationships, and reduce any negative impact to customers. Stacy Aguayo would like to see safety issues covered, as safety is a high priority. Jenine Schenk reported that the entire safety field hasn't been discussed in the metering task teams, or defined in the metering handbook. PSWG recommended the group disband at this point, however reserve time on 5/2/01 and discuss which issues are causing problems in measuring, or what items can be measured. Once issues are identified the group can determine when the MSP Performance Task Team can begin meeting again.</p> <p>05/02/01 The group brainstormed ideas/concepts on what criteria to</p>		



#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>monitor Meter Service Providers.</p> <p>TEP submitted a proposal for MSP performance monitoring. Stacy (APS): Does it make sense to create a PM packet based on current standards and then update and change the document and standards as they change in the future? Safety is a primary concern for APS and is a priority item to monitor. An example of safety criteria: How well did an MSP install that equipment/meter.</p> <p>TEP feels we need to get something down now, going over current documents. Timeliness of document submittal is a good item to track; safety hasn't been covered in PSWG so it TEP realizes it is more difficult to track.</p> <p>Jenine (APS) and June Greenrock (SRP) still find that it is hard to track the documents and what qualifies as a problem/event. The flow of documents for MSP is a more manual process (as compared to the MRSP process) so tracking is a concern/burden to the entities.</p> <p>The group came to a consensus that at a high-level performance monitoring can be done and the task team should meet again. The MSP task team has been assigned to review the ACC CC&amp;N, Business rule Comparison / Proposed Arizona Best Practices, and the Metering Form Packet and come up with high level processes (areas) and which documents should be used to monitor MSPs. At this point, thresholds to establish decertification and warning letters should NOT be done</p> <p>An item to keep in mind for future meeting: Performance monitoring tracking for the monthly PMR may be based on a percentage of errors of errors on transactions with that MSP on a daily basis. (Example: 25 transactions on Monday with 5 errors is a 20% error for the day).</p> <p><b>Action Item:</b></p> <p>The task team will present a draft document at the July 11 meeting documenting at a fairly high level what will be monitored and how it will be monitored.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>05/16/01 Minutes from 5/15/01 meeting were sent out 5/16. Documents were reviewed (CCN, Metering forms, ANSI standards) and items were selected to monitor</p> <p>06/06/01 John Wallace (GCSECA) gave a status report. John's concern is that the task team creates rules for MSP's without MSP representation. He suggests that the group finish what was started but not delve too much further into performance monitoring until further MSP representation is present. Bob Gray (Staff): mentioned that MSPs are notified by e-mail of meetings and it is up to them to represent themselves. Work should not be held up due to lack of representation. <b>Action Item: Commission Staff:</b> How does AXON CCN get removed? How do they get removed from the ACC certificated supplier list on the website?</p> <p>06/20/01 Substantial progress was made, a formal draft report will be ready for the next meeting, a reporting structure was created, daily event notification data fields were required were outlined. At this point, only monitoring Unexpected MIRNS on Initial Switch, Late MIRNS, MIRN data incomplete (missing data). Next meeting July 9<sup>th</sup>, at Grand Canyon State Cooperative facilities. 9:30 – 4 pm</p> <p>07/11/01 A final document has been distributed with the minutes from the 7/09/01 meeting. Have comments to Jenine Schenk by July 18<sup>th</sup> with a meeting scheduled for the 19<sup>th</sup>. Comments will be incorporated at the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. The document with</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>comments will be sent out the 23<sup>rd</sup>. The intent is to vote on this document at the August 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.</p> <p><b>ACTION ITEM:</b> All participants: Review and comment on the MSP document.</p> <p>08/01/01 This document needs similar verbiage as shown in the MRSP performance monitoring. Add to the end of the purpose: "The UDC may monitor MRSP performance, if the UDC decides to monitor MRSP performance in total or in part, the UDC may not exceed this standard." The vote for this document was included with the MRSP vote because the change is the same. A separate redlined version of the document will be distributed prior to the next meeting. The changes will individually be voted on followed by a vote on the entire document. Participants must send changes (a redlined copy) to Jenine Schenk by August 8<sup>th</sup>. <a href="mailto:Sjenine.schenk@aps.com">Sjenine.schenk@aps.com</a></p> <p><b>08/22/01</b> Final comments were reviewed and voted on for inclusion in the final document. Only one addition to the document was suggested. Citizens suggested addition to the introduction: "The UDC may monitor MSP performance, if the UDC decides to monitor MSP performance in total or in part, the UDC may not alter the non-compliance calculation method in this standard." <u>Vote to adopt the document with the addition to the introduction:</u> YES Votes: APS, CUC, Cooperatives NO Votes: TEP, SRP, Electrical Districts</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>Amended version failed.</p> <p><b><u>Vote to adopt the original document</u></b>  YES: APS, SRP, TEP, Cooperatives, Electrical Districts  NO: CUC  The document passed without revisions.</p> <p>The document will be inserted into the metering handbook and will be forwarded the Utilities Director for approval once implementation timelines have been gathered.</p> <p><b>ACTION ITEM</b>  A timeline to implement this process is needed from each entity. Send implementation timeline to Tony Gillooly by August 29<sup>th</sup>.  Jenine Schenk (APS) will insert the chapter into the Metering handbook and forward to Tony Gillooly (TEP) by August 29<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>11/14/01  MSP preformance Monitoring will be sent to Utilities Director as modified.  Issue closed.</p>		
62	If back billing is required for period where the customer is both Standard Offer and DA, for ESP Consolidated Billing, the ESPs will want to bill/pay only the DA period	02/08/00	Billing		10/26/00	<p><b>see Issue 7</b></p> <p>03/22/00 (New West Energy -Janie) to bring California options to next meeting.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> UDC's to see how can supply intermittent data.</p> <p>04/06/00 ESP's Proposal: Current bill agent will bill for current charges. Original bill agent will be responsible to bill the re-bill period for which they had relationship with the consumer. Dual Billing will be used as a back-up default when an original ESP is no longer in business or by mutual agreement by all parties involved.</p> <p>10/26/00 If the customer has gone DA/ESP Consolidated Billing and there is backbilling for the SO account, the UDC will bill/collect the customer</p>	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						directly and not involve the ESP. *Opened issue 96 to expand on related scenarios.*		
63	For ESP Cons Billing, if UDC or ESP charges are not transmitted by the drop dead date/time, what is the responsibility of biller to include language on the bill advising customer of missing charges.	02/08/00	Billing		11/16/00	<p>10/26/00 Most if not all UDCs have language in their op proc for this. Action item: UDC will bring their specific lang to Nov 16 mtng</p> <p>11/16/00 TEP and APS discussed their requirements. The group agreed that this issue should be handled in the UDC protocols.</p> <p>2/07/01 Resolution: The resolution is stated in the 11/16 note</p>	3	Resv
64	<p>How many decimal places should be required before applying the multiplier to a demand read?</p> <p>How many decimal places should be required for billing demand? (PSWG – Policy)</p> <p>In 867, when we convert the kW back to a read how many decimal places need to be accommodated?</p> <p>Do we want MRSP to give us usage/multiplier or give us actual read (w/ two decimal places)?</p>	02/16/00	Metering		04/13/00	<p><u>Action:</u> Can CIS multipliers be changed to “one” since the MRSP is adding in the multiplier to the demand provided in 867.</p> <p>Review 867 guideline to determine if the billing demand posted should have multiplier applied to it. MSP required to apply multiplier to the demand.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Utilities need to research when a demand figure is received from an MRSP, what is their process for backing out the multiplier and extracting the read. Considerations: Decimal points accommodated and having different multipliers for demand meters in CIS systems.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Check 867 requirements to ensure we are all on the same page. Check for all issues pertaining to the 867 (issue #64, #46, &amp; #65)</p> <p>03/16/00 What is happening on the MRSP reads? Reads are coming with inconsistent data. Example, some with 1 decimal place, others with up to 4 decimal places. UDCs take demand reads up to 2 decimal places. Any more than 2 decimal places are either truncated or rounded by UDCs in order to bill. This could cause demand calculation to be off from what the other party would be billing.</p> <p>Possible Solution: MRSP can deliver the read rounding to 2 decimal places. Or demand be figured on interval data only.</p> <p>Both ESP and UDC would have to bill off the same value (kW figured on read or interval data) to ensure same billing kW figure.</p> <p>Currently ESPs are not billing on demand. This will become an issue when they decide to start billing the demand. If they were to bill off the demand, they would extract it from the interval data. Although the read would still need to be supplied for VEE.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Participants need to go back to their companies to see if they can</p>	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>handle kW reads to 2 decimal places. Are the parties willing to say that this would be the standard.</p> <p>(Citizens Utilities) Their system is not set up to bill multipliers already applied. This will cause manual work on our billing staff and potentially result in billing errors.</p> <p>04/13/00 Consensus of Metering subcommittee – two (2) decimal places.</p>		
65	Arizona 867 requires MRSPs or UDCs to pass billing reads. Is this necessary? Could Interval data only be passed? Then UDC/ESP would be responsible for creating billing reads. Determine if read will be encoded or calculated.	02/17/00	Metering	08/15/00	06/22/00	<p>Confirm it is a requirement to have both begin and end reads. Yes, this is a requirement.</p> <p>03/16/00 (APS -Joe Webster) They need both the interval and billing reads. This is used for the VEE process. They would need reads off the register (encoded), not calculated reads. (SRP -Greg Carrel) on interval data accounts, they bill off interval data only. Interval data is VEEed on the interval data. (Navapache -Dennis Hughes) They have apx 7,000 interval data accounts. However, they bill off billing reads. (TEP) On very select occasions, they will bill off IDR data. However, they validate on billing reads.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> A small subcommittee will review possible solutions to this issue: Marv Buck, Janie Mollon, Tim Jones, Kimane Aycock, Joe Webster, Darrell Shear, Greg Carrel, and reps from TEP. They will report back to Metering Subcommittee on 04/13/00.</p> <p>04/27/00 Refer to UDC/ESP Proposal. (Citizens Utilities) sent comments their company does not support this proposal. Dennis Hughes reported that (AEPSCO) does not support this proposal. Subgroup took a vote to bring issue to full PSWG meeting and only 2/3 majority was reached. Further discussion needed. Renee Castillo and Marv Buck will develop memo to be sent out to full PSWG. Will set aside 1 hour of discussion to take place immediately after PSWG meeting on 05/03/00. All market participants are encouraged to attend the discussion.</p> <p>05/31/00 Proposal: Barry Scott presented unified Coop proposal for distribution metering. Citizens agreed with the counter proposal. Coops and Citizens prefer registered reads, but would take calculated reads if ACC staff would agree that calculated reads are treated as registered reads. Implemented for one (1) year from first DA customer in each respective territory, and issue of taking raw interval data reads then being revisited.</p> <p>06/22/00 RESOLUTION: Commission Staff agreed to 05/31/00 proposal.</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>07/19/00 (APS) provided handout of implementation issues/ process at subcommittee meeting. <u>Action:</u> (APS) to report on its implementation date.</p> <p>07/20/00 Missing intervals and zero intervals referred to next VEE session.</p> <p>2/07</p>		
66	<p>How are UDCs identifying master meter and showing subsequent sub-meters?</p> <p>Is there a common way to identify meters with same address with multiple meters? Currently UDC issues one MI form per meter.</p>	02/17/00	Metering		04/27/00	<p><u>Action:</u> Identify how UDCs are handing totalized metering and sites with multiple meters.</p> <p>04/27/00 Number of meters is Identified on the new EMI forms.</p>	3	Resv
67	<p>#1 If a master metered account goes DA, does ESP lose grandfathered agreements to continue with master metering?</p> <p>#2 If a master metered account is DA and an individual customer within the master metered property wants to return to Bundles Service, will the UDCs allow that individual customer to come back or vice versa</p>	02/17/00	Metering		09/18/00	<p>Action: for UDCs to research. Dave Rumolo will research FERC requirements.</p> <p>04/27/00 Dennis Hughes to follow up with Dave to verify status is of this issue.</p> <p>07/19/99 Most members agreed master metered accounts have right to go DA. (Phaser) noted this is not a problem in California.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> (TEP) will review its position and comment at Aug meeting.</p> <p>08/16/00 (TEP) Q1 -TEP will allow a master metered account to return to Bundled Service from DA as long as the property meets requirements and tariff is active. (See TEP position papers from 8/16/00 meeting) Q2 - TEP will allow individual customer to stay Standard Offer while master metered account goes DA (or vice versa). In this case, metering point must be upgraded to meet all of TEP regulations and service requirements to handle it as a single dwelling. This will require new underground or overheard service lines and an approved pedestal or meter socket at the customer's expense. (APS) Q1- No, customer does not lose master metering when returning to Standard Offer. Q2 - APS to report back with information at Sep meeting. (Navopache) Q1 - No, customer does not lose master metering when returning to Standard Offer. Q2 - Navopache to report back with information at Sep meeting. (Sulfur Springs Electric Cooperative) Q1 - Sulfur Springs to report back with information at Sep meeting. Q2 - Sulfur Springs to report back with information at Sep meeting.</p>	3	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						(Trico) Q1 Trico to report back with information at Sep meeting. Q2 - Trico to report back with information at Sep meeting  10/11/00 –resolved at a previous meeting (see minutes) or contact UDC for requirements		
68	Site Meets – What are UDC policies?	02/17/00	Metering		4/27/00	Add to Business Rule Document.  04/27/00 UDC policies and procedures have been added to the Business Rule Comparison Document.	1	Resv
69	What is the enforceability of recommended processes or rules of non-ACC jurisdictional entities? (PSWG – Metering)	02/17/00	Policy		2/21/01	Where does an ESP file noncompliance complaints for those entities that are not governed by the ACC rulings?  2/21/01 – Resolved – the group agreed that this issue was resolved when SRP and City of Mesa provided the appropriate documentation. See ground rules for clarification.	3	Resv
70	A utility can back-bill a third party (if party at fault) up to 12 months (R14-210-/e3). This is only specific to the utility. Should Rule be applicable to other participants and not just the utility?	02/22/00	Policy		2/21/01	*Refer to Issue 60 Should this Rule be modified to allow all parties providing meter data to be back-billed by recipients of the incorrect data?  2/07/01 (moved discussion from issue 60) According to the rules, there are specifics on how utilities bill a 3 <sup>rd</sup> party but there is no specification for any other market participants. (R14-2-210-E3)  10/12/00 The group agrees that the definition of Utility in the Rules covers all Certificated Providers and Affected Utilities Action Item: Marta will get confirmation from staff on resolution  10/26/00: Staff confirmed that "Utility" in section 201-212 refers to UDCs and certificated Comp Prov. Discussed that each entity should have their own processes – need Comp Prov input Action Item: Marta (staff) will clarify what 1612 b means and verify that MSP/MRSPs are "Utilites" is a duplicate of issue 60  Resolved 2/21/01 Since Issue 57 was confirmed by Staff, it is resolved that MSP, MRSPs are considered Utilities. See Issue 57 for sections of the rules that apply and those that do not apply.	3	Resv
71	If after receiving an RQ DASR and UDC is planning to disconnect for non-payment or turn off a customer prior to	02/24/00	Metering		06/20/01	<b>See issue 117</b>  This particular issue focuses more on how the metering side is handled when this type of issue arises. How to stop the meter exchange process.	3	RESV



#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	switch, what is process to notify ESP that customer will be disconnected. (PSWG – Billing)					<p>04/27/00 Will be reviewed when additional business processes are reviewed.</p> <p>05/02/01 The group discussed the issue for one hour prior to making a recommendation. The group agreed to send reject the DASR in this scenario with the appropriate reason code. Issue is resolved.</p> <p>TEP: DASR would be rejected if customer were delinquent. The comments field would state the reason why the DASR was rejected.</p> <p>APS: Customer would still be allowed to go DA if they were behind in payments. ESP will be notified, but no formal process has been set up.</p> <p>SRP: Its an internal process, but it would reject DASR and figure out the meter issue</p> <p>CUC: Citizens would contact the ESP by fax or e-mail of scheduled disconnect date. If the customer is disconnected, then Citizens would send a TS DASR. However, it was noted a TS DASR may only be sent by the UDC when 1) the ESP is de-certified or 2) when the UDC receives a RQ DASR from another ESP. Citizens will agree to reject the DASR</p> <p>This issue only covers the instance where an RQ DASR is sent prior to a switch. What happens AFTER a customer has switched to DA? A new issue (#117) was added to the master issues log to address this issue.</p> <p>5/16/01 ISSUE WAS RE-OPENED as Citizens CANNOT reject the RQ DASR. The issue will remain open until Citizens can present a position paper.</p> <p>06/20/01 Citizens presented an issues paper their process to notify the ESP in cases of disconnect for non-pay. Issue resolved</p>		
72	How are adjustments going to be handled in the 810.	02/24/00	Billing		10/12/00	<p><b>see Issue 7</b></p> <p>How will we communicate reason for Misc. adjustments.</p> <p>04/06/00 UDC's to come up with list of various adjustments made on a bill and be prepared to discuss at the next meeting.</p> <p>05/24/00 Revisions compiled for implementation guides of BEN and Rebate/ Rebill notification processes.</p> <p>10/12/00 Resolved: 810 Guideline covers this</p>	1	Resv
73	Is NERC using Standard Central	02/29/00	Policy		2/07/01	03/07/00 Address once NERC has made their decision on which standard	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	Time in Non-EDI transactions?  Why is NERC using Standard Central Time and should we be using it?					<p>time to use. Suggestion: Send a letter to NERC recommending GMT.  <u>Action</u>: Talk w/ your companies re: support of the GMT format (issue #46) as a standard so can file for a joint waiver. E-mail to Evelyn by 03/13/00. Evelyn will write the waiver to present to the ACC.</p> <p>Yes, NERC is using Central Standard Time.</p> <p>03/28/00 <u>Action</u>: Shirley &amp; Jim will flow out process' for converting data to Standard Time Zones.</p> <p>06/22/00 Priority set at 1.  2/07/01 Resolved – this was include in the Rule tweaking package in 2000</p>		
74	Navapache will be submitting a report to PSWG regarding what their business processes will be for DA. (PSWG – Metering)	03/02/00	Policy		2/07/01	<p>How should this report be represented in the 06/15/00 ACC report? This opportunity may need to be offered to all cooperatives.</p> <p>04/25/00 Dan Laos - this issue became a cooperative response. Executive summary has been submitted to the Policy Subcommittee.</p> <p>2/07/01 – information was included in 2000 report</p>	1	Resv
75	On incoming DASR – only kWh meter number is required. State DASR handbook does not accommodate a kWh meter and Kvar meters, or other metering combinations. (PSWG – metering)	03/16/00	DASR		05/02/01	<p><b>see issue 116</b></p> <p>04/18/01</p> <p>The group discussed the issue, and it was thought that it was understood to send one DASR per service delivery point, regardless of the number of meters at the service point.</p> <p>The EMI will indicate if there is more than one meter at the site. Janet Henry (AXON) says an MSP that gets an EMI indicating kVAR meter is required, an MSP will install one meter that reads both kWh and KVAR. Typically the MSP will leave the mechanical UDC kVAR meter wired and operating. UDC will have to remove their kVAR meter, or require a site meet.</p> <p>SRP and APS: Require one DASR for kWh meter only -not two DASRs.  Action Item: Confirm how the UDCs (TEP and CUC) want the DASR's submitted when there are multiple meters at a site.</p> <p>05/02/01</p> <p>TEP wants one DASR for kWh meter (per service delivery point). If KVAR meter is required, then that meter would be replaced with one meter that can meter both kVAR and kWh. If the kVAR meter is to be removed, TEP would remove it prior to the MSP installation.</p>		Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						Citizens concurs with APS and SRP that one DASR should be sent in the case where there is both a kWh meter and kVAR meter. The group agreed to close issue 75 as resolved, the DASR should be sent under the kWh meter number. However, other meter combinations including totalized meters and accounts with both metered and unmetered services needs to be addressed. Issue 116 was added to the issues list to address these additional Issues.		
76	On DASR – forecasted meter owner is a required field. Is this appropriate? Should this be taken off of the RQ DASR? (PSWG -Metering)	03/16/00	DASR		05/02/01	In step 3 of Metering Business processes, the pending meter owner is also required. Meter owner may change from the time the DASR is submitted to the time the meter is exchanged.  05/02/01 The group discussed the issue and agreed this field is required; the EMI process depends on receiving this information from the DASR. Issue is resolved.		Resolved
77	UMI was presumed to be national standard for identifying a single meter. It's not being used by any other state in dereg market. Most EDI documents are not implementing a UMI number. (PSWG – Metering)	03/16/00	Policy		03/28/00	Representatives from New West Energy, APSES, 1 <sup>st</sup> Point and Schlumberger are not using this number. It was suggested that this number not be implemented as an Arizona standard.  03/28/00 APSES does not need the UMI. Jim Wontor advises the UMI is not being used by MSP's (First Point & Schlumberger) in CA.  This is not an industry standard that we thought it would be. No compelling reason for market participants to use the UMI standard.  Proposal: Request Utilities Director remove requirement of using UMI standard from 05/01/99 report.	1	Resv
78	There is no language in Rules preventing MSP from contracting directly with customers, how should this issue be addressed?	03/28/00	Policy	08/07/00	08/16/00	System implications – Will MSP have to submit DASR's?  Rule change suggestion: Change the definition in Section R14-2-1601 "DASR means a form that contains all necessary billing and metering information to allow customers to switch electric service providers. This form must be submitted to the Utility Distribution Company by the customer's <del>Electric Service Provider</del> load serving entity."	1	Resolved
						This may force UDCs to create contracts for MSPs. ESP would send DASR but they would not be liable for MSP. Contract would allow UDC to hold MSP liable.		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p><u>Action:</u> All participants to assess impacts of MSP contracting directly with customer. Be prepared to discuss your company's position and provide solutions to this issue at the next meeting.</p> <p>05/09/00 (TEP) agrees there is no language in rules that precludes customer contracting directly with MSP. TEP would like to see language added to rules that would not allow a customer to contract directly with an MSP. (APS) identified contractual and system impacts if customer contracts directly with MSP. Systems and processes were developed to transmit DASR directly with ESP only. (APSES) leans towards customer not subcontracting directly with MSP. MSPs should work through ESP so customer doesn't end up with a metering system ESP or MRSP cannot read.</p> <p>06/22/00 To be reviewed by ACC staff. Is this within the purview of PSWG? <u>Action:</u> (due 06/30) Participants to submit position papers per 06/22/00 minutes.</p> <p>07/04/00 (Marv Buck) provided an overview of how other states are handling. Participants (NWE, APS, TEP, Phaser, SRP, APSES) presented their positions in a consolidated document to the PSWG.</p> <p>07/20/00 Steve Olea presented ACC staff position: Electric Competition rules allow MSPs to contract directly with customers; operating procedures need to be developed. Issue will include only MSPs at this time, but MRSPs will be kept on radar screen. <u>Action:</u> Participants may submit issue sheets, including 1) impact of issue on business processes and 2) any past practices in markets that provide insight to edryer@tucsonelectric.com by 08/07/00.</p> <p>8/16/00 Issue resolved would require rule change.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
79	Explore additional electronic methods for transmitting metering data.	04/27/00	Metering		11/29/99	06/22/00 Reassigned from Policy to Metering.  11/29/00 – The group has developed a standard process for exchanging data (EMI, MDCR & MORN) in excel format via e-mail. Until there is a need to look at other methods to communicate, this will be the standard for these forms.  2/07/01 – resolved 11/29/99	3	Resv
81	What information is provided on a CISR from each UDC and is that information consistent (Jim Wontor –APSES)	05/09/00	DASR		04/18/01	06/22/00 Priority set at 3.  04/18/01 Participants agreed to close the issue, because as Jim Wontor (APSES) suggested, PSWG is not the appropriate place to pursue these issues.		Resv
82	How are non-metered services going to be handled? What are the charges going to be? Who is responsible to maintain/bill for the services?	05/24/00	Billing		10/12/00	06/22/00 Assigned to Billing. <u>Action:</u> Each entity be prepared to discuss issue in July subcommittee meeting.  07/20/00 Participants concluded a separate bill for dusk-to-dawn lights or security systems does not make sense for a non-metered account customer. Members recognized 810 standard will not address non-metered accounts or non-energy related charges unless UDC and ESP agree to include such charges on an ESP consolidated bill.  10/12/00 Proposed 810 addresses the billing of non-metered services. If the non metered stays SO and the metered goes DA, the customer will get a separate bill for the SO un-met serv from UDC.		Resv
83	When customer switches from DA back to SO or ESP to ESP and the MRSP has not provided meter read data (or estimated reads) for previous months, what should the UDC/ESP do to retrieve missing data? How can the final bill get trued-up? Should the UDC/ESP be allowed to estimate the final bill?	06/22/00	Metering		4/18/01	<b>see Issue 65, 59, 60, 70, 83, 84,101</b>  06/22/00 <u>Action:</u> Each entity to provide their solutions on how to handle this issue in July subcommittee meeting.  07/20/00 (APS) discussed MRSP Performance Standards at the PSWG mtg. (TEP) Position on MRSP Performance Standards was provided.  08/16/00 Billing Subgroup is currently addressing.  04/18/01 The first part of this issue is covered in the MRSP Performance Monitoring issue 101. <u>When customer switches from DA back to SO or ESP to ESP and the MRSP has not provided meter read data (or estimated reads) for previous months, what should the UDC/ESP do to retrieve missing data?</u> If the file is posted as an exception, the second month without data makes the MRSP out of compliance.	1	Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>How can the final bill be trued up?</p> <p>This issue is resolved, part is to be covered in performance monitoring, issue 101 and the other two parts of this issue have been covered elsewhere and resolved.</p>		
84	Is the bill that is issued when a customer switches considered a "final" bill?	07/19/00	Billing		8/27/01	<p>9/28/00 Staff confirmed that the when a customer switches providers or disconnect service, it is a "Final Bill".</p> <p>10/12/00 The group agreed that R14-2-210 A5b should be addressed/modified with the next Rule Tweaking Package - Waiver not needed at this time. Will raise at Policy Group Nov 1</p> <p>10/26/00 this issue covers all of section 5 not just 5b, will raise at Nov 1 Policy mtng</p> <p>2/21/01 – the group agreed that this is resolved because Staff confirmed at a prior meeting that the bill is considered a Final Bill when the customer switches providers. Staff confirmed that by New West Energy's definition of "Customer", that one service point closure would not be a Final Bill. Barbara Keene disagreed and will follow up with Staff and report at the March 7, 2001 meeting before status is updated.</p> <p>3/7/01 – Staff needs additional time – will report at the 3/21/01 meeting</p> <p>3/21/01 - Barbara Keene communicated that Staff is still working on the issue. Staff is looking for feedback from the Participants on how their positions in an effort to help direct Staff on this decision.</p> <p>The group confirmed that there are 2 issues that need to be addressed...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the definition of a Final Bill and Customer</li> <li>2. Rules prohibiting estimation of Direct Access Bills and Final Bills – Need flexibility for situations where it is impossible to obtain reads (i.e. damaged meter etc.).</li> </ol>		Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>Barbara will report back at the 4-4-01 meeting. Deferred to 4/18.</p> <p>4/18/01</p> <p>Report from Barbara</p> <p>The ESPs are correct in how they use the term “customer” (see example), and the UDC’s may use the same definition. The customer is defined as whom the bill is issued to. EX: If there are 50 Walgreens, and the UDC bills to one entity for all 50 stores, then there would not be a final bill if one Walgreens chose another generation provider. This does not eliminate the conflict when the bill is sent to each individual store, and that one store chooses another provider.</p> <p>Two waivers are needed to resolve the issue: 1. Waiver to have the ability estimate final bill, 2. Waiver to have the ability to estimate usage for a DA customer requiring load data. In the waiver, it must be indicated how the rules should be re-written.</p> <p>Action Item:</p> <p>A joint waiver was suggested to resolve these issues. Judy Taylor (TEP) will bring a draft waiver for “estimating the final bill”. Judy will also look into creating the waiver for estimating usage of a DA customer, based on the “final bill” waiver for the May 2nd meeting.</p> <p>Action Item:</p> <p>Participants to contact their people to determine if each company is comfortable in supporting the joint waiver.</p> <p>05/02/01</p> <p>Judy Taylor (TEP) presented draft waivers for the Final Bill and estimating usage for load profiled customers.</p> <p>John Wallace (GSECA) suggested re-arranging some of the text. This document appears to be more of a rule change request than a true waiver. A waiver is needed to get immediate relief from the inability to estimate. A second document proposing new language for the rules and citing examples why estimation may</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>occur in the waiver may be a better route to pursue.</p> <p>Barbara Keene (Staff) indicated that a rule change could take years. She suggest that it may be better include rule changes in a separate document, but still attach to the Waiver. Is this waiver two separate documents, or one document (waiver) with an attachment (rule tweaking)? Barbara will check which documentation is preferred (one or two documents).</p> <p><b>ACTION ITEM:</b> Judy Taylor will revise the Waivers, separating the rule language from the waivers seeking relief from the current rules. She will confirm with Barbara (Staff) that two separate documents are appropriate. New drafts will be passed out at the 5/16 meeting.</p> <p>6/20/01 Drafts were reviewed; company name changes were suggested, new drafts, ready for signatures may be presented at the 7/11 Meeting.</p> <p>07/11/01 Judy Taylor (TEP) presented draft waivers for the Final Bill and estimating usage for DA customers. Citizens suggested minor language changes that were accepted by the group.</p> <p>Waiver to estimate usage for First and Final Bill – all participants approved the waiver</p> <p>Waiver to estimate data for DA customers requiring load data – All participants approved the waiver.</p> <p><b>ACTION ITEMS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judy Taylor (TEP) will contact Ajo and Morenci to see if they wish to be included in the submittal of the waiver; will include them to the waivers, if necessary.</li> </ul>		



#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Participants must e-mail Judy with appropriate person in each company to send the signed waiver by Wednesday July 18, 2001. <a href="mailto:jtaylor@tucsonelectric.com">jtaylor@tucsonelectric.com</a></li> </ul> <p>Judy Taylor (TEP) will send out the waivers with appropriate signature pages via certified mail July 20<sup>th</sup>. The original signed documents must be returned to Judy by August 20<sup>th</sup> as the document will be docketed the 21<sup>st</sup>.</p> <p>08/01/01 The proposed rule change language was reviewed and approved. The ACC staff has the proposed rule language and will consolidate these changes and others at the next rule making proceedings.</p> <p>NOTE: The waivers were sent out via e-mail because only two companies responded with physical mailing address. Judy is looking for original signed pages by August 20, 2001.</p> <p>08/22/01 Update <u>UPDATE ISSUE 84: Waiver to estimate for first and final bill and waiver to estimate for a DA customer requiring load data:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Morenci was added to the waiver, but then was uncomfortable signing the waiver; TEP was unable to get their signature at the last minute.</li> <li>SRP and City of Mesa need to submit a letter to Director Utilities Division in support of the waiver.</li> <li>Navopache only sent a signature page for one waiver, -- the first and final bill waiver.</li> </ul>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
86	Standardization of application of long-term contracts on Standard Offer Tariffs	07/20/00	Policy		2/07/01	<p>This issues refers to R14 1606 C6 which states <i>After Jan 2,2001, tariffs for Standard Offer Service shall not include any special discounts or contract with terms or any tariff which prevents the customer from accessing a competitive option, other than time-of-use rates, interruptible rates, or self generation deferral rates.</i></p> <p>11-01-00 Barbara Klemstine clarified the issue and requested Staff to confirm the interpretation of this section. Additionally, UDCs are to come back to the Dec mtng with any rate restrictions when a customer comes back to SO.</p> <p>12/4/00 – TEP advised that they have 2 tariffs in conflict with R14 1606 C6. SSVEC may have tariffs in conflict. SRP &amp; APS advised they do not have tariffs in conflict. John Wallace will confirm with the Coops. Action Item: Staff to advise on next steps</p> <p>2/07/01 – prior resolution: Barbara Keene reported that that ACC will handle on a case by case basis</p>		Resv
87	Should a customer (w/out a UDC contract) be required to secure a new provider w/in 60 days after returning to Standard Offer?	10/04/00	Policy		08/01/01	<p>APS' Schedule #1 section 3.5 has this requirement</p> <p>08/01/01</p> <p>Stacy Aguayo (APS), This is a section in APS's terms and conditions. If a DA customer is involuntarily returned to SO, the customer has 60 days to choose a new provider. If the customer does not choose an ESP, the customer must stay on the SO rate for one year.</p> <p>The issue was closed because it was an internal issue to APS and does not impact or require input from participants.</p>		Resolved
88	Can an existing Standard Offer customer own their meter? And can a DA customer coming back to SO who owns their meter, retain ownership?	08/00/00	Policy		8/01/01	<p>Many UDCs require the DA meter to be removed and a UDC meter installed when a customer returns to Stndrd Ofrr.</p> <p>10/05/00 Staff will look into the issue</p> <p>10/11/00</p> <p>APSES and CUC provided their position papers for discussion. Staff will advise if the rules allow Standard Offer customers to own meters at the November 1<sup>st</sup> Policy meeting.</p> <p>11/1/00</p> <p>Staff confirmed that Standard Offer Cust can not own their own meter. Deb Scott confirmed that a waiver/rule change will be required– Next steps will be for all participants to draft position papers identifying why they support or why they do not support.</p> <p>12-4-00 The group agrees that this issue is not clearly stated. Some</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						companies interpreted this to include ownership and maintenance and others did not. Issue 100 was added. 2/07/01 Resolved on 11/1/00		
89	Need a mechanism for costing assoc. metering equip	08/00/00	Policy		2/21/01	Paul Taylor raised the issue of looking at maximum costs for metering equip. Wants to ensure that equipment is sold at fair costs  2/21/01 – Resolution – There is not a requirement to purchase and the fair market value will be determined by the buyer. Buyer has the option to install their own equipment.		Resv
90	What is the UDC process for external devices		Metering		2/21/01	TEP – External devices can be used with an approved meter with KYZ pulse output. Meter must have visual display of kWh and kW. See TEP handout or Business Rule document from additional info APS – External devices are allowed with approved meters. Continued discussion on how the device will be powered. APS to report back on position SRP – External devices are allowed with approved meters.  10/11/00 – APS POSITION STILL UNDER REVIEW  11/15/00 External device positions have been updated for APS, CUC and AZ Coops – See Business Rule doc attached to the Nov 15 minutes  11/29/00 All company positions were updated at 11-15 meeting – will update status at next metering meeting 2/07/01 – will resolve with metering business rules  2/21/01 – Resolved – UDC positions have been updated in the business rule document and will be added into the Metering Handbook	1	Resv
91	How many decimal places should be visually displayed for kW on the meter?	08/00/00	Metering		11/15/00	10/11/00 – same as issue # 64 10/25/00 – re-opened since this issue involves the display and 64 deals with the billing of demand.  11/15/00 – After further discussion it was decided that is wasn't an issue since visual demand display is not used for billing purposes – Issue Resolved		Resv
92	How do UDCs handle a customer requested disconnect for UDC or ESP? How do we differentiate between a DA customer and Bundled customer? What	9/13/00			08/01/01	10/11/00 Issue raised by Janie Mollon (NEW) in the metering group – referred to Policy to assign to the appropriate group. – <b>TEP, APS, SRP, AZ Cooperatives</b> Refer the customer to the ESP for DASR submittal to the UDC. Once the DASR is received the UDC will initiate the orders to disconnect the service.		Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	type of training?					<p>08/01/01</p> <p>The training required to identify DA customers is an internal process, but all the participants indicated that the process is to route the customer's request to the ESP.</p> <p>Issue was closed</p>		
93	Where will documents be published and how will the Maintenance be handled?	10/12/00	Policy		2/7/01	2/07/01 – documents will be approved by the Utilities director and posted to the ACC website.		Resv
95	What is the start read for a new meter sets	10/25/00	Metering		08/01/01	<p>10/25/00 Do meter set have to start at zero? Action item: participants will come back to November mtng with positions</p> <p>11/29-00 – SRP, TEP, APS require DA meters to be set at zero and CUC &amp; SSVEC do not require reads at zero. Pending feedback form other Cooperatives</p> <p>08/01/01</p> <p>SRP: must be set to zero</p> <p>SSVEC: the read can be zero or any number</p> <p>GCSECA: the read can be zero or any number</p> <p>TEP: the read can be zero or any number</p> <p>CUC: the read can be zero or any number</p> <p>APS: must be set to zero</p> <p>Issue was resolved now that the co-ops stated their position.</p>		Resolved
96	If backbilling is required for a period when as customer was served by and ESP and is not longer with that ESP, who is responsible for billing and collecting?	10/26/00	Billing		11/16/00	<p>10/26/00 Copied discussion frm 04/06/00 ESP's Proposal: Current bill agent will bill for current charges. Original bill agent will be responsible to bill the re-bill period for which they had relationship with the consumer. Dual Billing will be used as a back-up default when an original ESP is no longer in business or by mutual agreement by all parties involved.</p> <p>10/26/00 Action Item: Participants to come back w/positions on how this should handle (hold EPS responsible, bill cust directly, etc) Consider credit bal refunds also.</p> <p>11/16/00 APS presented a proposal on how to handle back billing. The group supported this proposal. See attachment to 11/16/00 minutes</p> <p>2/07/01 – Resolved at the 11/16/00 meeting</p>	1	Resv
97	D-Star is requiring 10 minute intervals for imbalance settlement,	11/1/00	Policy		08/22/01	11/1/00 FERC is requiring this by 12-15-01 – Unsure on when the PSWG should start addressing this.		Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>CA went to 10-min intervals on 8-1-00 and are doing in line interpolation. 08/22/01</p> <p>Evelyn Dryer (TEP) indicated that <u>generators</u> need 10-minute intervals for imbalance, data does not need to be in 10 minute intervals the residential/retail market. D-Start entity may take 10-minute intervals and line-interpret to an hour for settlement and billing.</p> <p>There is an algorithm proposed in the D-star filing that addresses this issue. This issue can be closed because it does not affect the retail customer with the proposed algorithm.</p>		
98	Develop transfer mech from UDC to participating ESP for Environmental Surcharge	11/1/00	Policy		2/21/01	<p>11/01/00 Surcharge is supposed to take effect 1-1-01</p> <p>2/21/01 Resolved – The group agreed to hand off to the ACC Environmental workgroup</p>		Resv
100	What process can be developed to facilitate a customer installing an IDR meter and equipment before DA that allows a customer to move to DA and back with the same equipment.	12/4/00	Policy		4/18/01	<p>12/4/00 Action Item: Participants to draft position papers identifying options and send to Evelyn Dryer by January 24, 2001. Evelyn will consolidate position papers and send out prior to the February7, 2001 meeting.</p> <p>3/7/01 – <u>CUC</u> LeeAnn Torkelson (R.W. Beck/Citizens) provided a handout (attached) and reported that CUC will be willing to purchase DA IDR meters when a customer is returning to Standard Offer. The only requirement is the meter must meet their meter standards. Currently, CUC has a load requirement for Commercial Standard Offer customers where an IDR meter is required. Residential Standard Offer customers are not eligible for IDR metering.</p> <p>Action Item: LeeAnn will report the actual load requirement for Standard Offer customers at the March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. Also, if CUC would be willing to sell the CUC Standard Offer IDR meters to the customer when the customer has opted for Direct Access service.</p> <p>SRP provided a handout and reported that SRP will install an IDR meter at a customer's request while they are standard offer. Fees relative to this request were unknown and will be clarified at the March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. SRP will not transfer equipment ownership or sell meter equipment. If SRP remains the MSP for customers opting for Direct Access service, the SRP IDR meter may stay in place while the customer is a DA customer and can be used for Standard Offer services if the customer returns. If the customer opting for DA services selects a third party MSP other than SRP, the SRP IDR meter must be removed and replaced with a customer, ESP</p>	1	Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>or MSP owned IDR meter.</p> <p>Action Item: SRP to confirm fees associated with the installation of an IDR meter for a Standard Offer customer at the 3-21-01 mtng.</p> <p>TEP and Cooperatives were not ready to report. Will report at the March 21, 2001 meeting.</p> <p>APS presented their current process for transferring ownership of the meter to allow a customer to switch between standard offer and DA with the same meter at a previous meeting</p> <p>3/21/01  Evelyn Dryer (TEP) reported on TEP' proposal (attached). TEP will agree to transfer ownership of a meter to the customer/service provider when going DA for average book value for the class and IDR type of the meter being transferred. And allow the meter to be transferred back to TEP when the customer returns to Standard Offer, TEP will pay the utility's average net book value adjusted for the passage of time for the class of meter being transferred plus administrative and service establishment charges. The depreciation will be rounded to the next highest year in the determination of the net book value at which the utility/UDC repurchases the meter from the customer/service provider.</p> <p>John Wallace (GCECA) reported on the Cooperative proposal (attached). The Cooperatives reported that they are not able to accommodate issue 100 for several reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With the exception to Navopache, the Cooperative territories are not open</li> <li>2. Significantly higher costs of purchasing, interrogating and maintaining IDR meters that are not being recovered through current rates</li> <li>3. Would be required to hire and train additional meter personnel to program, interrogate and maintain IDR meters</li> <li>4. Currently, no way to determine if it would be economically feasible to offer IDR metering to Standard Offer Customers.</li> </ol> <p>Exceptions: Some Cooperatives (i.e. Trico) may be able to accommodate Issue 100 in the future since they are beginning to install IDR meters.</p> <p>LeeAnn Torkelson (R.W. Beck/CUC) confirmed that CUC will not be able to provide IDR meters for Standard Offer Customers regardless of load. At such time that CUC offers IDR meters to Standard Offer customers, they will look at proposals to accommodate Issue 100.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>SRP SRP confirmed that they have a one time only fee for Standard Offer customer to request an IDR meter to be installed.</p> <p>Janie Mollon expressed a concern of how this will be documented to ensure that the UDC will not change their minds at a later date. The group agreed that this issue is closed with the exception of implementation. The group will wait until the draft-metering handbook is out to determine how Janie's concerns will be addressed.</p> <p>04/04/01 LeeAnn (RW BECK/CITIZENS) reported on an action item from the March 21 meeting -- Citizens does not have any IDR meters listed on their accepted meter list at this time that they would be willing to purchase.</p> <p>TEP will confirm if they will waive a meter test charge if the meter had been tested within the time period specified in the rules for meter testing</p> <p>04/18/01 TEP confirmed waiving a fee for meter testing if the meter was tested within a given time period.</p> <p>Tony Gillooly said that when a DA customer returns to SO, if the meter is in good shape and has been tested (calibrated) in the last 5 years, the meter would be purchased by TEP without charging a testing fee. This issue has been resolved; all UDCs have processes set up to accommodate this issue.</p>		
101	MRSP performance monitoring and certification		Task Team		8/22/01	<p>2/07/01 Task team was established, chaired by Janie Mollon due date 4/04/01</p> <p>3/7/01 The group reviewed and made recommendation to the status report. Additional task team meetings are required.</p> <p>3/21/01 Janie Mollon (New West Energy) reported that she has received comments back on the Performance document and will be addressing the comments from the March 7, 2001 Policy meeting as well. Janie will have drafts of the requested standard letters available for review by the group at the next Task Team meeting. -- The next meeting will be held at New West Energy on April 12<sup>th</sup>. An agenda will be sent out confirming the date and</p>		Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>time</p> <p>04/04/01</p> <p>Janie Mollon (New West Energy) passed out a “Questions and Answers – Performance Monitoring Report” handout. This document is a compilation of comments from participants at meetings and e-mails to Janie. It will be used to clarify the issues that need to be covered in the next MRSP performance-monitoring meeting.</p> <p>A concern discussed at this meeting is that MRSP could be compliant regarding the PM, but still be de-certified for some other infractions not covered by the PM.</p> <p><b>Action Item:</b> What are MRSP de-certification and ESP processes/rules for your company? And does this information belong in the PM document? Present at the MRSP meeting April 12, 2000</p> <p>04/18/01</p> <p>John Wallace reported on the status of the task team. Terms were defined, event, exception, violation, out of compliance. Problems were identified in how to count the various events/violations/exceptions for the PMR. This topic is to be discussed in the next meeting. Draft warning letters were standardized. Minutes and warning letters were sent out 4/18/01 by Mary Ippolito</p> <p>The warning letters going to ESP and MRSP are still a problem. There are some confidentiality issues in revealing the problems of an MRSP in other ESP territories to all other ESP's. Kathy Flood (SRP) requested a legal clarification from ACC legal department on this issue.</p> <p>Janie Mollon proposed monitoring solely by ESP (eliminate the aggregate monitoring), it will not be as complicated to monitor and eliminates the legal ramifications of sending warning letters</p>		



#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>to all ESP's</p> <p>John Wallace will be the new chair as Janie Mollon has been re-assigned at New West Energy.</p> <p>An action item report from staff regarding to what happens to the letter sent to the director of the utilities division.</p> <p>The letter must state that it is an informal complaint. A person on the utilities director's office staff will handle the issue. If this does not resolve the issue, the formal complaint process must begin.</p> <p><b>Action Item:</b> Barbara Keene will contact the Staff legal department for clarification on the right of the UDC to send warning letters to ESP's regarding the performance of their MRSPs in other ESP territories.</p> <p>5/16/01</p> <p>Staff advised PSWG on the legalities of sending the warning letters to ESP's regarding the performance of their MRSPs in other ESP territories</p> <p>The UDC can give out violation information, unless there is a contract restricting the flow of that information. Violations are not considered confidential if the entity holds a CC&amp;N.</p> <p>06/06/01</p> <p>With the loss of AXON representation, PSWG requests another MRSP attend the meetings.</p> <p>Comments from staff regarding minutes from the MRSP meetings</p> <p>1) May 3<sup>rd</sup> : What is ACC continued Certification in the minutes and the draft? John Wallace stated that this is directly from the MRSP document posted on the ACC website.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>2) May 17<sup>th</sup>; GMT Waiver. Staff wonders what this waiver is. From Tony, this was not a waiver; it was misstated in the minutes.</p> <p>It is agreed that Interval data should be in GMT time, confusion is regarding if the header field for the EDI transaction is considered the “envelope”, or if the time the entire EDI file is sent (e-mail) is the “envelope”.</p> <p>06/20/01 Next meeting is scheduled for June 21, 2001, GCSEC Facilities.</p> <p>7/11/01 A final draft document will be sent out July 13<sup>th</sup>. Comments are due by the 20<sup>th</sup>. If there are significant comments, another meeting for the task team will be scheduled to review and address the issues. Barring any major concerns, the intent is to vote on this document at the August 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.</p> <p><u>Questions from the task team:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Can we add the MRSP Performance monitoring to the Metering handbook to the Arizona State Direct Access Handbook?</li> </ul> <p>Evelyn indicated that historically that the MSP and MRSP are two separate companies. It is better to keep the documents separated. Created a new issue to address the consistency issue between the MSP and MRSP documents. Resulted in a new issue# 124</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What is the responsibility of the MRSP task team pertaining to decertification. Resulted in a new issue #125</li> <li>○ Should the VEE document be included with the metering handbook, or remain a stand-alone document? Resulted in a new issue #126</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION ITEM:</b> All participants: Review and comment on the MRSP document. Send comments to Kimarie Aycock (APS) by July 20<sup>th</sup>.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>08/01/01</p> <p>Additions to the document:</p> <p>Merilyn Ferrara (APSES) indicated that:</p> <p>the document does not cover the day of install and needs to be explicitly stated this document doesn't address this topic</p> <p>the document does not cover a grace period (timeframe unknown) before performance monitoring starts and should be noted in the pending additions section. (under pending)</p> <p>the document needs to indicate that the UDC may use performance monitoring for de-certification, but Performance Monitoring may not be the only criteria for de-certification.</p> <p>Paul Taylor (Beck/Citizens) requested the document be a guideline, not necessarily a requirement for the UDCs to perform. A point to consider is who's VEE is "right" in the instance where the UDC and MRSP perform VEE. To address this concern, SSVEC drafted this language to add to the end of the purpose statement: "The UDC may monitor MRSP performance, if the UDC decides to monitor MRSP performance in total or in part, the UDC may not exceed this standard."</p> <p>The group voted to whether to accept the document "as is", or add these comments into the document and delay the vote to the following meeting. Those entities voting in favor of accepting the document as presented were: SRP – Kathy Flood, SSVEC – Barry Scott, and TEP – Tony Gillooly. The following entities prefer to see an updated document that includes the comments from this meeting prior to voting to adopting the document:</p> <p>Citizens – Paul Taylor: APS – Kimarie Aycock, GCSECA--John Wallace , APSES – Merilyn Ferrara</p> <p>A separate redlined version of the document will be distributed prior to the next meeting. The changes will individually be voted on followed by a vote on the entire document.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>Participants must send changes (a redlined copy) to Kimarie Aycock by August 8th. <a href="mailto:Kimarie.aycock@aps.com">Kimarie.aycock@aps.com</a></p> <p>08/22/01</p> <p>Final comments were reviewed and voted on for inclusion in the final document.</p> <p><u>Vote to add suggested language to the Purpose:</u></p> <p>YES: APS, CUC, Cooperatives NO: TEP, SRP, Electrical Districts</p> <p>The sentence as suggested by Citizens will not be added to the document.</p> <p><u>Vote to add the suggested language to the Purpose &amp; Pending addition sections by APSES:</u></p> <p>YES: APS, TEP, CUC, Cooperatives NO: SRP, Electrical Districts</p> <p>Group approved the APSES additions.</p> <p><u>Vote to adopt the entire document with amendments by APSES</u></p> <p>YES: APS, TEP, Cooperatives NO: CUC, SRP, Electrical Districts</p> <p>Document was not approved with APSES amendments</p> <p><u>Vote to adopt the document with no additions:</u></p> <p>Yes: TEP SRP Cooperatives, Electrical Districts, APS No: CUC</p> <p>The document, with no revisions was approved.</p> <p>The document will be forwarded to the Utilities Director for approval once implementation timelines have been defined by each utility.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<u><b>ACTION ITEM</b></u> A timeline to implement this process is needed from each entity. Send implementation timeline to Tony Gillooly by August 29 <sup>th</sup> .		
107	Develop a document showing all agreed upon Metering business rules				10/24/01	2/07/01 Task team was established, chaired by Stacy Aguayo due date 3/07/01  2/21/01 – The group reviewed a proposed outline for the Metering Handbook  3/7/01 The group agreed that the scope of this task has increased substantially. At this time, the Task Team will focus on filling in the sections that pertain only to issues the PSWG has approved and address the other sections later. With this specific focus, the Task Team is aiming to finalize their work by the April 4 <sup>th</sup> meeting.  3/21/01 Stacy Aguayo (APS) reported that the team is on task to have a draft of the AZ Metering Handbook ready for the April 4th meeting.  04/04/01 The Overview: Needs more information and detail regarding document purpose and how to read the document. Comments appreciated. Ch 1 and 2: This general information was never discussed in PSWG or other AZ meetings. This is a compilation from other utilities (out of state) as well as in-state processes. Comments appreciated. It was suggested moving the metering forms document approved by PSWG and currently posted on the ACC website into the metering handbook so ESP/MSP have a single place to look.  <b>Action Item:</b>		Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>Participants need to review and redline the document. Send comments to Stacy Aguayo by April 18<sup>th</sup>. A draft incorporating all the comments will be presented by May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2001 meeting.</p> <p>04/18/01  Stacy will create a master document of changes showing all substantive changes to text. Comments due no later than May 2<sup>nd</sup>. Each future meeting will have a two-hour discussion on these changes, beginning May 16<sup>th</sup></p> <p>Sections of the Handbook from the Operating Procedures, that cannot have content changes because it is an approved document: (requires using the change control process):  Section 2: MSP qualifications, 3.10 Primary metering and 3.4 ANSI standards</p> <p>Comments on the metering form packet from Staff: Two UDCs are missing: Aho Improvement Company, Morenci Water and Electric (Pgs 5 &amp; 21 data elements). Can these UDCs be listed in this document despite not participating in the formation of the document?</p> <p>Report from Staff on Section 1.6 metering Handbook: This section is redundant from the rules, suggested removing the section details, but reference the State Rules (a general reference, not a specific listing of a rule).</p> <p><b>Action Item:</b> Barbara will contact the two missing UDCs and advise them of the work of the PSWG and what standards have been developed. She will add them to distribution list so they can become active participants. Status report at May 2 mtg.</p> <p>05/16/01  Minor changes were included in the presented redlined version (typo's, spelling, other little errors). Substantial changes were discussed and are noted on the "Participants Comments" chart. A new revision will be sent</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>out prior to the June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting where the document will be further discussed.</p> <p><u>Overview</u> -- Minor Changes to wording</p> <p><u>Chapter one – Preface:</u> -- Instances of “standard offer” will be changed to “bundled Service”</p> <p><u>Chapter two – MSP Qualifications:</u> Tabled to the next meeting, Barbara Keene stated substantial changes may be made to this section despite being copied from approved documents.</p> <p><b>ACTION ITEM:</b></p> <p>All Participants: Look at the following chapters to clarify meaning: Chapter 2, Section 3.4 and 3.10 for the June 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.</p> <p><b>Chapter three – Equip requirements and meter products</b></p> <p>Section 3.9: define what load research meters are; re-word the remainder of the paragraph.</p> <p><b>Chapter four—Ownership -- Sections 4.3 and 4.3.1 to read 25 kV and below rather than zero up to 25kV</b></p> <p><u>Chapter 5, 6, 7 – No changes</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 8- Process flows</u> - Minor changes</p> <p><b>Chapter 9- Providing Meter information – minor changes</b></p> <p><b>Chapter 10- Purchasing/Transferring equipment-- Additions to “Purchasing of Existing Equipment” # 4 and #5.</b></p> <p><b>Reference documents:</b></p> <p>(1)TEP Comments, (2)Participants Comments on State of Arizona Direct Access Metering Handbook, (3) Citizens Comments, (4) Operating Procedures for Performing work on primary metered customers</p> <p>06/20/01</p> <p>Citizens presented additional over-all document comments.</p> <p>Chapter 2 and Chapter 3.10 (primary metering) will be reviewed in a</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>separate meeting because there are too many problems and inconsistencies in these sections. Stacy Aguayo will be setting up this meeting.</p> <p>Send any further grammatical corrections to Stacy (APS) by next week June 27 e-mail <a href="mailto:stacy.aguayo@aps.com">stacy.aguayo@aps.com</a></p> <p>The document was reviewed up to page 27 and will continue to be reviewed at the next meeting.</p> <p>07/11/01</p> <p>Evelyn Dryer (TEP) objected to the UDC re-writing chapter 2 because the classifications were written by actual MSPs in '96, '97. MSPs were the driving force behind the section, with no MSPs to review the document; substantial changes should not be made.</p> <p>Jenine Schenk (APS) indicated that no skills were removed, text was cleaned up/consolidated, and verified that each of the classes' knowledge increased as the class level increased. An APS sample was passed out.</p> <p>The remainder of the document was reviewed and corrected.</p> <p>The following questions were discussed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Can a UDC class 1 worker (or equivalent) be exposed to an energies panel up to 300 volts?</li> <li>2) Do you allow UDC class one workers inside energized panels to connect communications? If no, do you allow class one to get inside panels to install meters?</li> <li>3) How many classes of meter workers do you have?</li> </ol> <p>These questions are a moot point because these sections relate to what work an MSP will allow their personnel to do, not what the UDC's allow their personnel to do.</p> <p>The group decided to re-vamp Chapter 2. Section 3.10 was reviewed. Both sections need further work.</p>		



#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p><b>ACTION ITEMS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evelyn Dryer (TEP) will add to the introduction that chapter 2 was initially written by MSPs.</li> <li>▪ Jenine Schenk (APS) will remove the content changes to chapter 2, but the format changes will remain.</li> <li>▪ Rick Molina (TEP) will redline section 3.10 for the next meeting. The documents related to these action items will be distributed by Friday July 19<sup>th</sup> with responses back to back to the submitting parties by Wednesday July 25<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul> <p>08/01/01 Chapter 2 and Section 3.10 of the metering handbook were reviewed and discussed. Chapter 2 An overall comment/concern was raised by Paul Taylor (Beck/Citizens) that the UDC is required to follow the same rules, meaning that the UDC may have to set up the 3 worker classes as outlined in Ch 2. Removed last sentence in section 1.5, which indicated the UDC will follow the same rules set up in this document when operating as an MSP/MRSP. Removed for further review and re-wording.</p> <p>There is a concern that Certified may have a legal implication and maybe “certified” should be changed to “qualified” to avoid any problems with a MSP indicating their workers are certified No one knows who certifies the MSP workers, UDCs do not want the responsibility and the associated liability.</p> <p>The proposal of the group, as none of the UDCs are comfortable with the chapter, is to leave the chapter alone with the exception of two minor corrections. The corrections are: the inclusion of a sentence in the introduction indicating MSPs created chapter 2; and Class three workers should indicate a journeyman certificate is needed. A task team should be formed to correct the problems</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>in the chapter in the future.</p> <p>Section 3.10 – Primary Metering</p> <p>Last two sentences in 3.10.1 will be moved to 3.10.2 and will be re-written so that “UDC” will be changed to “MSP” and the “shall” will be “shall not”. Add “isolation and grounding to the last sentence after “switching” and before “operations”. The numbering system will be adjusted for clarity.</p> <p>Letter “B” was re-worded</p> <p>No changes to A, C and F. Changes were made to D, E. G was removed.</p> <p>3.10.2 “The UDC, in coordination.. “ sentence was removed. Added, “unless mutually agreed upon. ... “ to last sentence.</p> <p>3.10.3 Sentences were removed in the middle of the paragraph</p> <p>3.10.4 No changes</p> <p>3.10.5 Removed the first sentence. New wording proposed for the last sentence from APS. Other minor wording changes.</p> <p>3.10.6 Minor changes</p> <p>3.10.7 Minor changes, remove example.</p> <p>All changes to date will be accepted and a final draft will be sent out. By August 8th. Comments should be sent to Stacy by August 15th. <a href="mailto:Stacy.aguayo@aps.com">Stacy.aguayo@aps.com</a></p> <p>08/22/01</p> <p>An updated version was provided at the meeting with some minor changes to spelling, grammar, and new line numbering</p> <p><u>Page 8: Line 275</u>, Remove the reference to ACC website</p> <p><u>Page 9: Line 322</u>: Remove “affected utility” add MSP to line.</p> <p><u>Page 27: Line 1144</u>: Change text to remove “Excel” and clarify that document should be Excel format. Eliminates implication participants must use the Microsoft program.</p> <p><u>Page 27: Line 1157</u>: Added verbiage to explain the file naming convention.</p> <p><u>Page 21: Line 884 to 901</u>:</p> <p>3.10.1.1 (and remove number 3.10.1) Move 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph from 3.10.1.2, then remove remainder of 3.10.2</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p><u>Page 22 Line 905:</u> remove “primary” from section 3.10.2</p> <p><u>Page 9 line 354:</u> Add “when applicable” to end of sentence.</p> <p>New Issue 130: Need to create glossary of deregulation terms.</p> <p>Paul Taylor (RW BECK/Citizens) will send out a paper with Citizens concerns regarding this document for group review.</p> <p><u>Vote to adopt the document with changes above and correcting section 3.10 to reflect “pending further development”.</u></p> <p>Yes votes: APS, TEP, SRP, Cooperatives, Electrical Districts No votes: CUC</p> <p>The document will be forwarded to the Utilities Director for approval once implementation timelines have been defined by each utility.</p> <p><u>ACTION ITEM</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A timeline to implement this document is needed from each entity. Send implementation timeline to Tony Gillooly (TEP) by August 29<sup>th</sup>. <a href="mailto:Tgillooly@tucsonelectric.com">Tgillooly@tucsonelectric.com</a></li> <li>2. Review section 3.10 sections A-F to make sure there are no gaps in what an MSP can and cannot do on primary metering. Stacy Aguayo (APS) will coordinate a meeting to discuss this section prior to the 9/12 PSWG meeting 9/12/01</li> </ol> <p>Stacy Aguayo (APS) indicated that the document with revisions from last meeting have been completed, but were not submitted to Tony Gillooly (TEP). The group did not discuss section 3.10. It will be discussed at the September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001 metering meeting at APS</p> <p>The group reviewed APS’s comments to Citizens document posing questions and concerns about the handbook.</p> <p><u>Item 1:</u> New sections added to the document will require the PSWG to review the handbook and update/correct those sections (through the change control process) that may be affected by the newly created section. The group consensus is that it is okay to submit the document that is incomplete to establish to ESPs what is a standard at this time.</p> <p><u>Item #2</u> Group consensus indicated this item needs to be addressed.</p> <p><u>Item #3</u> Group consensus indicated this item needs to be addressed</p> <p>Action Item: All Utilities: What would legal departments suggest rather than use the word “certified”</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>in this section  <u>Item #4</u>  Group consensus indicated the need to revisit the requirements of the meter display.</p> <p><u>Item #5</u>  First bullet. Does not need further addressing. The section is intended to meet the requirement of 1612 L.15  Second Bullet: Needs further addressing. The group should review section 1.4 with section 3.4.  The group stopped reviewing the APS comments to Citizens concerns <b>at this point</b>. The group decided not to submit the document in its current state to the Utilities Director. Further Discussion and changes need to be made at a future meeting.  Action Item:  Each utility needs to address the comments by Citizens (similar to what APS did).  Each Utility will draft language in areas where appropriate.</p> <p>9/26/01  APS and TEP respond to Citizens comments. The rest of the participants will present their responses next meeting.</p> <p>10/24/01  Consolidating PSWG State Metering Handbook and removing Chapter 21. By consensus the PSWG agreed to send the State Metering Handbook as modified to the Utilities Director for approval. Chapter 21 will be discussed as its own issue.  Issue resolved.</p>		
108	Inconsistency involving transmission and ancillary services as non Competitive in definitions (1601 29) and C - Competitive in Billing elements(1612 O) and tariffs (1606 C2) (ACC Staff)				2/7/01	<p>2/21/01 – Staff is requesting the PSWG develop a recommendation on the issue.</p> <p>3/7/01 After much discussion the group agreed that although transmission is listed as a Competitive charge the definitions state that it is non competitive, and the recommendation is not to move transmission to Non Competitive. The intent is that a customer can look at their unbundled bill and see what and see what parts other entities may provide. The group is exploring other <u>future</u> options like changing the titles of Non Competitive and Competitive to something else.</p> <p>3/21/01 Barbara Keene communicated that her report back to the Commission on this issue is due April 10<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>With the exception of APS, all participants agreed to removing “Competitive” and Non Competitive from the Billing Element section (R-14-2-1612 O )</p> <p>APS will communicate directly to Barbara Keene their position on this issue by March 26, 2001.</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						The group agreed that Issue 108 is closed.		
109	New CC&N application needs to be reviewed to verify there are no inconsistencies between what the PSWG has approved. (ACC Staff)				3/21/01	<p>2/21/01 – ACC Staff raised the issue for the group to address  <b>Action Item:</b> Ken Grove volunteered to review the MRSP CC&amp;N requirements and report back at the March 7, 2001 meeting.  <b>Action Item:</b> Janet Henry volunteered to review the MSP CC&amp;N requirements and report back at the March 7, 2001 meeting.</p> <p>3/7/01 – Jim Wontor reported on suggestion to include items mentioned in the CC&amp;N doc in the approved VEE standards and the performance monitoring doc so the MRSPs have one document that identifies what the expectations are to operate in AZ. The group agreed and passed suggestion to Task Team.</p> <p>Janet will report on MSP CC&amp;N doc at 3/21/01 meeting.  3/21/01 Janet Henry (AXON Field Solutions) reported no inconsistencies in the MSP CC&amp;N requirements and suggested the MSP Performance Task Team look at incorporating the requirements into the Performance document.</p> <p>The group agreed to assign the review of the document regarding certifying workers to classification and how this is going to be accomplished. Janet will highlight the document areas that need to be considered in this review.</p>		Resolved
111	SRP raised the issue of changing the AZ 810 to show the read field as Conditional rather than Mandatory		Policy		06/06/01	<p>3/7/01 – The majority of the group agreed to make the change. Gene Schlecta (SRP) will make the change and send it out for review and will be discussed at the March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.</p> <p>3/21/01 The group agreed that this field is Conditional since a read is only required to be on the bill for Residential customers and not required for Commercial. SRP' has an issue with this since they do not show reads for interval metered customers regardless if it's a Commercial or Residential customer. Gene Slechta will take this back to SRP to re-look at the issue before the group agrees to approve changing the meter read field to Conditional from Mandatory.</p> <p>04/04/01 Gene Slechta (SRP) reported that SRP' billing system does not have the capability of providing beginning and ending reads on the 810. SRP commented that the ESP can calculate the beginning and ending reads from the 867 billing data for residential IDR customers. The field will be populated if the UDC can provide the reads.</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p><b>Action Item:</b> All participants review the options and be prepared with response for May 2<sup>nd</sup>.</p> <p>Should this field be conditional or optional? Further discussion is needed at the May 2nd meeting. Discuss the options below:</p> <p>The three options discussed regarding the requirement for sending beginning and ending reads for Residential IDR customers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Let the state process drive the requirement</li> <li>2. Let the market drive the requirement (between ESP/MRSP)</li> <li>3. Obtain a waiver or have the commission change the rules requiring printing the beginning and end reads for Residential IDR customers</li> </ol> <p><b>Action item:</b> Gene and Shirley will review 810 documents for conditional field definitions and make recommendations as needed.</p> <p>5/16/01 Discussed language that needs to be added to the field to make it conditional.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SRP presented if they plan to provide the reads in the future, or if have no plans to provide the reads <b>ANSWER:</b> SRP plans to provide the reads in the future.</li> <li>2. Participants discussed field MEA06 in the demand measurement segment. Determine if the field is necessary. If it is a necessary field, what are the conditions for the field? The demand <u>with</u> multiplier applied is mandatory. While the demand <u>without</u> the multiplier applied is conditional. <b>ANSWER:</b> The field is necessary, as some utilities send it on their bills, however a business reason why the field is conditional is still uncertain. If no reason can be found to make the field conditional, it will be changed to "optional".</li> </ol> <p><b>Action Item for All participants:</b> What business reason(s) make the field "demand without multiplier" conditional?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. TEP shared their evaluation that they will always send the read and the impact of always sending the reads if the receiving partner does not need the reads (as in the case of commercial customers). <b>ANSWER:</b> Changed the gray box for the field to "send for all residential customers".</li> </ol> <p>06/06/01 On the demand side for the element "demand without multiplier"</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						SRP determined that this field is conditional. The greybox field will state "required if the customer is a residential customer over 20kW".  Document was approved, Gene will make the changes and distribute to PSWG. The changes will be submitted to the ACC Utilities Director.		
112	Develop a master list of all acceptable meters within each UDC territory		Policy		09/12/01	3/21/01 Raised by Navopache  09/12/01 The group discussed and resolved the issue by identifying in the metering Handbook (section 3.2) that states "refer to specific UDC". Each ESP will have to go to each Utility to get the approved meter list for that service territory.		Resolved
114	What are (are there) state the timing requirements for meter testing?	04/18/01	Policy		9/12/01	04/18/01 PSWG Policy  09/12/01 The group discussed the issue and determined there are no state standards. This issue is resolved by answering the question. Any state meter testing and timing requirements will be addressed with issue 107—the metering handbook.		Resolved
115	How will kVAR meters be removed when both kVAR and kWh meters are present at a site and an MSP installs a single meter that can read both kVAR and kWh?	04/18/01	Policy		09/12/01	04/18/01 PSWG Policy  09/12/01 The group resolved the issue by stating there will be no state standard. Each utility will have a different practice.		Resolved
119	Reading the rules R14-2-1612C, it seems to indicate that the ESP is held to a higher standard since it appears they must report self-slamming. Is this true? (Citizens)	06/06/01	Policy		9/12/01	9/12/01 Group agreed this was resolved.		Resolved
123	Citizens CIS system requires a meter number on accepting the TS DASR, but this	06/06/01	Policy		10/24/01	06/06/01 Suggestion is to add "conditional" to the header, add the meter number as a conditional field to the TS DASR.		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	DASR doesn't have the meter number as a requirement. What changes can be made to accommodate this.					<p>7/11/01 Pending Task Team</p> <p>9/26/01 Citizens needs to go back and get clarification on issue. On agenda for 10-24-01</p> <p>10/24/01 The group agreed that the TS DASR will be modified to reflect CUCs changes. DASR handbook will be sent to director. Issue Resolved</p>		
124	The appearance is dissimilar between MRSP and MSP performance monitoring documents. Should these be consolidated into the same book with consistent formatting?	07/11/01	MRSP PM task team		9/12/01	<p>07/11/01 May include a DASR section, VEE section, etc.??</p> <p>09/12/01 The issue was discussed, all utilities believe the documents should be separate. They are two different processes for potentially different entities.</p> <p>Resolve the issue</p>		Resolved
126	Should the VEE document remain a stand-alone document?	07/11/01	MRSP PM task team		9/26/01	<p>07/11/01 An option is to include it in a statewide DA handbook.</p> <p>09/12/01 TEP recommended, and other utilities other than CUC agreed that the VEE and MRSP Performance monitoring documents be combined as a start of an MRSP Handbook. Issue will remain open to see if Citizens can agree with consensus to combine the documents.</p> <p><b>Action Item:</b> Citizens Determine if Citizens agrees the documents should be combined as the start of an MRSP handbook.</p> <p>9/26/01 Citizens agreed that the documents should be combined as the start of an</p>		Resolved



#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						MRSP handbook Issue was resolved.		
131	Does Citizens need a waiver, or is there a work around for CUC to be in compliance with the 5-Day response to the DASR?	8/22/01	Policy		9/26/01	<p>08/22/01 The specific case is when a DASR is received by CUC for a customer requesting DA at a property where there is currently an active account.</p> <p><u>Action item:</u> LeeAnn (Citizens/Beck): Find out if CUC's system rejects or accepts the RQ DASR.</p> <p>09/12/01 LeeAnn Torkelson (Citizens/ RW Beck) reported on the action item if Citizens accepts or rejects the RQ DASR in this case. If the customer has an account number, the RQ DASR (under a manual process) could be accepted</p> <p>After much discussion, the PSWG determined a waiver is not needed if Citizens can respond by rejecting the RQ DASR with appropriate code and comment in the "comments" field.</p> <p>Citizens should expect the ESP to contact Citizens and ask for further explanation and work the DASR in a manual process.</p> <p>Issue remains open pending an answer to the action item.</p> <p>Action Item: Citizens Paul Taylor (RW BECK/Citizens) will determine if Citizens can respond using appropriate codes and comments to reject the DASR.</p> <p>9/26/01 Update from Citizens stated that they will not need a wavier, as they have a manual work around.</p>		
132	Identify chapters in the metering handbook that would be easy for the UDCs to address (i.e. Stickers, labels, trouble calls, etc).	8/22/01	Policy		09/12/01	<p>08/22/01 This is to just identify the chapters, not COMPLETE the chapters!</p> <p>09/12/01 Clarification: this topic is supposed to identify topics in the metering handbook that requires only UDC input (not MSPs/ESPs/MRSPs input)</p>		Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						After discussion it was decided to resolve the issue because the group can start drafts of all open sections.		
134	File comments on harmonization across utility sectors of a grace period.	10/24/01	Policy		11/14/01	<p>10/24/01 The group decided to submit comments on behalf of the PSWG to the ACC. Comments are due to Shirley Renfroe by 11-2-01</p> <p>11/14/01 Comments were consolidated by Shirley Renfroe and submitted. See minutes.</p>		Resolved
135	Update the list of ESP's on the ACC web site	10/24/01	Policy		11/14/01	<p>11/14/01 Erinn Andreasen, Commission Staff said that the company in question should file for a cancellation of its CC&amp;N. The staff would take notice if the companies were not filing in a timely manner.</p>		Resolved